

British Artists and the Second World War,  
With Particular Reference to the War Artists'  
Advisory Committee of the Ministry of Information

A thesis submitted to University College London,  
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D.,

History of Art

by Brian Frederick Foss, 1991.



### Abstract

The War Artists' Advisory Committee, under the chairmanship of Kenneth Clark, was established in November 1939 by the Ministry of Information "to draw up a list of artists qualified to record the [Second World] war at home and abroad..., to advise on the selection of artists from the list for War purposes and [to] advise on such questions as copyright, disposal and exhibition of works and the publication of reproductions." It ceased operation at the end of 1945, after which time two other committees supervised the final acquisitions, and the distribution of the WAAC collection to museums and other institutions in Britain and abroad. Some 5887 paintings, drawings, prints and sculptures were eventually secured by means of funds administered by the Committee.

This thesis constitutes the first systematic study of the formation of the Committee, its aims and objectives, and its policies and activities. Its often stormy relationship with the Ministry of Information is considered, with particular emphasis on disagreements over the validity of using for propaganda purposes the paintings, drawings, prints and sculptures acquired by the Committee. An analysis of the works acquired by the WAAC indicates areas in which its collecting policies betrayed unevenness or bias. The partial (if unofficial) role of the Committee as a body attempting to ensure the wartime employment of artists in capacities appropriate to

their skills is considered in relation to the prospects of artists from c.1935 to 1945. Other forms of wartime employment - with government ministries, with the Armed Services, or with projects organised by individuals and institutions concerned with artists' welfare - are briefly described, and their degrees of effectiveness evaluated.



For the Keeper and Staff of the Department of Art,  
Imperial War Museum:

Angela, Mike, Jenny, Jan, Pauline, Robin and Nick

Almost every activity of the two Great Wars has been chronicled in detail. But, as far as I know, the story of this particular enterprise [the War Artists' Advisory Committee, 1939-1945] has never been published except in the form of piecemeal notes. ... Surely so original and successful a venture should have a more worthy niche in history.

-Colin Coote, War Office representative  
on the War Artists' Advisory Committee<sup>1</sup>

## Table of Contents

List of Illustrations.....	9
Acknowledgments.....	11
Abbreviations and Locations.....	15
Introduction.....	17
Structure and Methodology.....	17
Resources and Literature.....	21
Endnotes.....	28
Chapter 1. Employment and Unemployment, c.1935-1945.....	30
Artists and Unemployment.....	31
Art Teachers.....	38
Commercial Artists and Illustrators.....	45
Designers.....	51
Art Sales.....	58
Endnotes.....	70
Chapter 2. Wartime Employment and Patronage Schemes.....	87
Artists and Art Organisations in Wartime.....	87
Employment: Art(s) Organisations.....	95
Government and Armed Services Employment.....	115
State Patronage of Art.....	126
Kenneth Clark and the Ministry of Labour.....	137
Endnotes.....	145
Chapter 3. WAAC: Formation, Structure and Policies.....	165
Formation of the WAAC.....	165
Operation of the WAAC: Selection of Artists.....	176
Committee and Ministry.....	198
Endnotes.....	212
Chapter 4. War Art as Propaganda.....	220
The MoI, the WAAC, and the Idea of Propaganda.....	220
WAAC Publications and Reproductions.....	237
WAAC Exhibitions.....	252
Endnotes.....	282
Chapter 5. Picturing the War.....	297
Introduction.....	297

Portraits.....	300
Home Front Subjects.....	320
Armed Services Subjects.....	346
Endnotes.....	371
Chapter 6. 1945-1947.....	384
1945 and the Burlington House Exhibition.....	384
1946-1947: The Dispersal of the WAAC Collection.....	390
Conclusion.....	401
Endnotes.....	406
Afterword.....	410
Endnotes.....	415
Appendix 1. Artists.....	416
Part 1.....	417
Part 2.....	419
Part 3.....	421
Part 4.....	424
Part 5.....	425
Part 6.....	465
Part 7.....	469
Part 8.....	470
Appendix 2. Attendance at WAAC Meetings.....	471
Appendix 3. Censored Pictures.....	473
Appendix 4. WAAC Exhibitions in the Provinces.....	496
Appendix 5. 1945 Burlington House Exhibition.....	506
Appendix 6. Sample Post-war Distribution of WAAC Art.....	511
Bibliography.....	515
Section 1.....	517
Section 2.....	538
Section 3.....	548
Section 4.....	561
Section 5.....	568
Section 6.....	581
Section 7.....	599
Illustrations.....	603

## Illustrations

- (1) Paul Nash, Follow the Fuhrer: Above the Clouds (not a WAAC work), 1942, watercolour, ink and collage, 15 11/4" x 22 1/2" (IWM: LD7226).
- (2) Hilda B.C. Harrison, A Woman Bus Conductor (purchased, 1943), 1942, chalk on paper, 18 1/2" x 14 1/2" (IWM: LD2941).
- (3) Reginald Eves (War Office Artist), Lieutenant-General Sir Ronald Adam, Bart., CB, DSO, OBE, 1940, oil on canvas, 24" x 20" (IWM: LD404).
- (4) Eric Kennington, Leading Seaman Walker of HMS Eclipse (commissioned, 1940), 1940, pastel on paper, 30 1/4" x 21 3/4" (IWM: LD145).
- (5) Anthony Gross (War Office Artist), Subedar-Major Narain Singh, Subedar-Major Argandhar, Regimental Sergeant-Major Rose of the Essex Regiment 5 Brigade, 4th Indian Division, 1943, pen and wash on paper, 15" x 22" (IWM: LD3196).
- (6) Muirhead Bone (Admiralty Artist), St. Bride's and the City After the Fire, 29th December 1940, 1941, chalk and pen on paper, 77 7/8" x 44 1/8" (IWM: LD1076).
- (7) Graham Sutherland, The City: A Fallen Lift Shaft (commissioned, 22 August 1940), 1941, gouache on paper, 25 1/2" x 44" (IWM: LD893).
- (8) William L. Clause, A Fire Guard Team, Exeter (commissioned, 8 February 1943) 1943, oil on canvas, 25 1/4" x 30" (IWM: LD3175).
- (9) Laura Knight, Ruby Loftus Screwing a Breech-ring (commissioned, 14 December 1942), n.d. [1943], oil on canvas, 34" x 40" (IWM: LD2850).
- (10) Stanley Spencer, Shipbuilding on the Clyde: Burners [centre panel] (commissioned, 19 March 1940), n.d. [1940], oil on canvas, 42" x 60" (IWM: LD433).
- (11) Mona Moore, Land Girls Carting Oats at Southminster, Essex (commissioned, 29 August 1941), 1941, watercolour on paper, 15" x 21 3/4" (IWM: 1471).

- (12) Edward Ardizzone (War Office Artist), The Shelter Warden Looks Over His Flock, n.d. [1940], watercolour on paper, 9 5/8" x 12 1/2" (IWM: LD474).
- (13) L.S. Lee (Royal Army Lieutenant), The Final of the Brigade Association Football Cup, 8th January 1944 (purchased, 1944), 1944, watercolour on paper, 7 1/4" x 11 3/8" (IWM: LD3986).
- (14) Charles Cundall (Air Ministry Artist), Stirling Bomber Aircraft: Take-off at Sunset, 1942, oil on canvas, 31 1/2" x 50" (IWM: LD1849).
- (15) Albert Richards (War Office Artist), Crashed Gliders, the Landing-zone at Ronville, 1944, n.d. [1944], watercolour on paper, 21" x 28 3/4" (IWM: LD4232).
- (16) Eric Ravillious (Admiralty Artist), HMS Ark Royal in Action, 1940, watercolour on paper, 16 3/4" x 22 3/4" (IWM: LD284).
- (17) Frank Wootton, Rocket-firing Typhoons at the Falaise Gap, Normandy, 1944 (purchased, 1944), oil on canvas, 41 1/2" x 59 1/2" (IWM: LD4756).
- (18) Charles Cundall, The Withdrawal from Dunkirk, June 1940 (commissioned, 1940), 1940, oil on canvas, 40" x 60" (IWM: LD305).
- (19) Paul Nash (Air Ministry Artist), Target Area: Whitley Bombers Over Berlin, 1940, watercolour on paper, 22 1/2" x 30 3/4" (IWM: LD827).
- (20) Leslie Cole (War Office Artist), Sick Women and the Hooded Men of Belsen, n.d. [1945], oil on canvas, 24 1/2" x 34" (IWM: LD5017).
- (21) Norman Wilkinson, The Tanker "Ohio" in a Malta Convoy, August 1942 (presented, 1944), n.d., oil on canvas, 30" x 45" (IWM: LD6005).

### Acknowledgements

My deepest gratitude must go to the Association of Commonwealth Universities for making this thesis possible through the award of a Commonwealth Scholarship, and to the British Council (personified by the unfailingly cheerful Allison Edwards) for administering my income over the following three years in London. Equally important has been Joseph Darracott, my external supervisor. He has capitalised on his extensive knowledge of British art and art organisations of the 1930's and 1940's to direct my attention to points of interest that would otherwise have been missed. He has also been a heartening source of encouragement over the five years that this thesis has been in preparation, and never moreso than when he was patiently reading and annotating first drafts of individual chapters that, in several cases, were over two hundred pages in length.

In addition, I have benefited from having two internal supervisors in the History of Art Department at University College. Jill Lloyd acted in this capacity from 1985 until her departure from UCL at the beginning of 1989, and gave the proposed topic early and crucial support. Andrew Hemingway has subsequently offered a wealth of invaluable criticisms and suggestions regarding methodology, organisation, and the theoretical frameworks within which the entire question of government involvement in arts support can most profitably be con-

sidered. I am deeply indebted to him, both for consenting to act as a supervisor and for his consistently thoughtful and challenging assessments of the individual chapters.

I also owe much to the Keeper of the Department of Art at the Imperial War Museum, Angela Weight, and to her staff: Michael Moody, Jenny Wood, Jan Barrington, Pauline Allwright, Robin Hamilton, Nick Booth and (before her departure in 1987) Ann Compton. They provided a very liberal degree of access to the Department's entire Second World War archive and art collection, and answered an apparently endless string of queries on increasingly esoteric topics (and did so on increasingly short notice, as the five years ran down). They made me - for all intents and purposes - an honorary member of the Department, for which I am very grateful. Without their generous daily supplies of favours and assistance this thesis would have taken significantly longer to research and write.

Many other archives and libraries in Britain and North America were consulted during the research process. Particular thanks are extended to the staffmembers at the National Art Library, London, for their promptness in retrieving the several thousand items requested over the three years from 1985 to 1988; to the employees of the Library of the Imperial War Museum; to those who work in the Tate Gallery Archive; and to Lucy Whittacker and Angelina Bacon at the National Gallery Archive, London. Documents held in the following archives are quoted or otherwise referenced with the permission of those



responsible: the Imperial War Museum, the National Gallery, the Tate Gallery, the Public Record Office at Kew, the Bankside Gallery (London), the Tom Harrisson Mass-Observation Archive (University of Sussex), the History of Advertising Trust (London), the National Gallery of Canada (Ottawa), the Art Gallery of Ontario (Toronto), the Musée des beaux-Arts de Montréal, the California Palace of the Legion of Honor (San Francisco), the Museum of Modern Art (New York), the South African National Gallery (Cape Town), the Johannesburg Art Gallery, the Australian War Memorial (Canberra), the Art Gallery of New South Wales (Sydney), the Art Gallery of Southern Australia (Adelaide), the Dunedin Public Art Gallery (New Zealand), and the National Library and the National Art Gallery of New Zealand (both, Wellington). All references to unpublished theses are also made with permission.

How I prepared my M.A. thesis using only a pen and a typewriter remains an unpleasant memory, and I am therefore thankful to the several people who have patiently guided me, over the past four years, through the joys and the trials of computers: Shashi Kanbur and Peter Albach in London, René Juneau in Toronto, and Roger K.K. Truong and Simon Wong at Everlink, Montréal (for much technical assistance, but especially for not laughing at my inexperience when I mistakenly thought I had erased the entire text only a month before final submission).

Finally, I would like to acknowledge three people whose

ongoing friendship has been a critical factor in the production of this thesis. Much is owed to Jenny Wood for the pleasure of her company and conversation on several holidays, motoring trips and evenings out; for her patient checking of dates and page numbers at the Colindale Newspaper Library; and (with Steve Perry) for taking me in as a multi-week houseguest on my research trips to London in 1989 and 1990. Finally, to Ian and Naoko (Yamagata) Crawford goes my sincere gratitude for many of my best times over the past five years in England, Scotland, France, Italy and Australia. Their friendship and interest have given more to me (and hence to this thesis) than either of them will suspect.

### Abbreviations and Locations

AFS - Auxiliary Fire Service  
 AIA - Artists' International Association  
 ARP - Air Raid Precautions  
 ATS - Auxiliary Territorial Service  
 Bankside Gallery - Bankside Gallery archive, London  
 BIAE - British Institute of Adult Education  
 CAS - Contemporary Art Society  
 CD - Civil Defence  
 CEAW - Committee on the Employment of Artists in War-Time  
 CEMA - Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts  
           (from April 1940: Council for the Encouragement of  
           Music and the Arts)  
 CIAD - Central Institute of Art and Design  
 ENSA - Entertainments National Service Association  
 FAP - Federal Art Project (Public Works Administration,  
           United States)  
 GP/ - [see Section 7 of the Bibliography]  
 IAL - Imperial Arts League  
 IWM - Imperial War Museum, London  
 IWM: Documents - Department of Documents, Imperial War  
                   Museum, London  
 IWM: Sound Records - Department of Sound Records, Imperial  
                   War Museum, London  
 MoA - Ministry of Agriculture  
 MoHS - Ministry of Home Security  
 MoI - Ministry of Information  
 MoL - Ministry of Labour (from 1939: Ministry of Labour and  
           National Service)  
 MoS - Ministry of Supply  
 MoWT - Ministry of War Transport  
 NFS - National Fire Service  
 NG Archive - National Gallery Archive, London  
 OUP - Oxford University Press  
 PRO - Public Record Office, Kew  
 RA - Royal Academy of Arts; Royal Academy Archive, London  
 RAF - Royal Air Force  
 RCA Archive - Royal College of Art Library, London  
 RIBA - Royal Institute of British Architects  
 RSBS - Royal Society of British Sculptors  
 RSPWC - Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours  
 SEAC - South-East Asia Command  
 SIA - Society of Industrial Artists  
 Tate Archive - Tate Gallery Archive, London  
 Tom Harrisson Mass-Observation Archive - (at University of  
   Sussex, Falmer)  
 WAAC - War Artists' Advisory Committee  
 WAAF - Women's Auxiliary Air Force

WRNS - Women's Royal Naval Service  
WVS - Women's Voluntary Services

## Introduction

The subject of life in Britain during the Second World War has been a rich mine for historians from 1939 to the present. Every aspect of society was sharply and, in many cases, irrevocably affected. Some of the changes had been in preparation before 1939, while others owed their existence principally to the War. However, whether the War was a creator or a catalyst of social change, its impact was extreme. By 1946 the country was well along the road to becoming the modern Welfare State. In the arts, the end of the War was coincident with the creation of the Arts Council. Wartime links forged between the state and the arts were crucial for their post-war relationship, just as leading wartime figures in arts support - notably Kenneth Clark - were also key figures in this area after 1945.

## Structure and Methodology

This thesis considers one aspect of state involvement in the visual arts from 1939 to 1945: the War Artists' Advisory Committee (WAAC; chaired by Kenneth Clark) of the Ministry of Information. It begins with a two-chapter discussion of the employment of artists during the late 1930's and during the War itself. The first chapter considers job prospects (c.1935-1945) for art teachers, commercial artists, and designers, as

well as the difficulties encountered by men and women selling their work either through commercial galleries or at members' exhibitions staged by artists' groups. Chapter 2 examines the variety of organisations and projects - governmental and extra-governmental, and many of them created only after the War had begun - that were concerned with keeping artists at work from 1939 to 1945. This chapter also notes various aspects and implications of the government's involvement as a supporter of the visual arts during these years, and most notably the place of Kenneth Clark within this web of support.

Only after the establishment of this background does the thesis go on to study the WAAC itself. Chapter 3 is concerned with the formation of the Committee and its relationship with the Ministry of Information. Chapter 4 describes and evaluates its use (or failure to use) the war art collection for purposes of propaganda and publicity, argues that the uneasy relations between the Committee and the MoI derived from their often conflicting notions of how art functioned as propaganda, and develops an analysis of the subtle means by which works of art could - from the WAAC's point of view - function as propaganda without sacrificing their status as "high culture" artefacts.

Chapter 5 deals with the subject matter of the 6000 war pictures and sculptures acquired by the WAAC. This analysis traces the visual expression of certain ideals (especially important during the War) of national character and unity, and

thus supports the proposals made in Chapter 4. It also comments on certain other attitudes and expectations (notably towards the role of women in wartime, and regarding the appropriateness of the War as a subject for artists) as revealed in the WAAC collection as a whole. Chapter 6 focuses on the WAAC's final exhibition (1945), and on the subsequent dispersal of the collection to institutions in Britain and abroad. The examination of the dispersal of works is seen to bolster claims, made in earlier chapters, that Kenneth Clark intended the war art to contribute to the "development" of popular taste in addition to being useful as a subtle organ of wartime propaganda. Chapters 3-6 thus detail not only the history of the WAAC as a body, but also probe its assumptions about the nature, importance and practical usefulness of art at a time of extreme social upheaval, and relate these concerns to the larger issue of state patronage. Finally, the Afterword comments of the lack of critical attention that has tended to be accorded the WAAC in the published literature, and hypothesises (with reference to points raised earlier in the thesis) as to why this has been the case.

The thesis thus operates on more than one level, combining administrative history with economic contextualisation, analysis of what have elsewhere been called "national fictions,"<sup>2</sup> consideration of the inter-relationship between art and propaganda in wartime, and an overview of a key experiment in state patronage of the arts.

However, it should be noted at the outset that the thesis is not about the careers of individual artists. The WAAC is a huge topic that can easily support several more theses, and to attempt to deal with more than a few carefully defined aspects of its history would have courted both organisational confusion and flagrant disregard of thesis length restrictions. Given that this is the first thesis to be devoted to the Committee, it seemed best to address two general areas of enquiry on which little or no published work is available: the administrative and social background that resulted in the government's decision to take the apparently unlikely step of engaging in large-scale support of the visual arts in wartime; and the web of issues involved in the inter-relationship of state patronage and propaganda during the Second World War.

This is not to imply that the artists have been ignored in the production of the thesis. The large number of relevant endnotes, as well as the rather lengthy section of the Bibliography that is devoted to studies of the war artists, indicate that their reactions and reminiscences have been used extensively in the formulation of the arguments presented in the following pages. The reader seeking more detailed information on the wartime careers of specific artists is referred to the principal texts noted in the following section, to the sources cited in the Bibliography, and to Appendix 1.



### Resources and Literature

In terms of research this thesis relies very heavily upon archival material (summarised in Section 1 of the Bibliography), and upon contemporary publications - especially the periodicals and little magazines, which have been invaluable in establishing the ambience of public and critical attitudes and expectations. Subsequently-published memoirs and diaries (such as those of Harold Nicolson, John Lehmann and Harold Macmillan) have been similarly useful.

Important caveats should be noted regarding the use of archival material. As a result of the socially disruptive character of the War, record-keeping was often sporadic. An important example is the Contemporary Art Society, for which there is "no archive material to speak of" dating from the war years.<sup>3</sup> Although it would be useful to know precisely how many people visited art exhibitions in London and the provinces, or what the wartime salaries were for more than a handful of commercial artists, information of this type was often not recorded at all by the institutions involved. Formal surveys and censuses were reduced severely in number in the six years after 1939, from their proliferation throughout the 1930's, and many of the statistics that are available are crude approximations or assumptions. These problems were aggravated by the sheer destructiveness of the War. At the height of the V-1 bombings, for example, 20,000 houses were damaged every day. The V-1s had completely destroyed or damaged beyond repair

25,000 houses in London by the end of September 1944. Raids earlier in the War had demolished or rendered beyond repair another 84,000 houses in the capital.<sup>4</sup> Little wonder, then, that many lacunae plague the extant archival records.

In many other instances papers survived the War, only to fall victim in later years to the weeding of files. It is known, for example, that almost all documents pertaining to the use of artists to record wartime naval activities, held by the Admiralty, were intentionally destroyed before the end of 1948.<sup>5</sup> In addition, of the artists and other individuals who were associated with the WAAC and who have been the subjects of interviews, few have provided information that is not available elsewhere. (Of those who, before their deaths, were members of the WAAC itself for more than a few weeks, only one - Kenneth Clark - became the subject of a substantial recorded interview about the war years. Regrettably, the interview was conducted after his memory had begun to fade, and was thus marred by many serious errors.<sup>6</sup>)

As for published literature relevant to the topic, the survey is necessarily brief. (This is itself is an interesting comment on the historiography of British twentieth-century art, and is considered as such in the Afterword.) The War isolated British artists from their colleagues on the Continent and thus fostered a new independence that divided wartime art from what had gone before. Yet little serious work has been done on the art of the years 1939-1945. General studies of

twentieth-century British art have been augmented by more detailed research dealing specifically with the wartime work of a very few of the artists involved with the WAAC (notably Henry Moore, Paul Nash, John Piper and Graham Sutherland); but research outside the mainstream of Modernism has been sketchy.

In 1983 Meirion and Susie Harries published their book The War Artists: British Official War Art in the Twentieth Century (London: Michael Joseph, in association with the Imperial War Museum and the Tate Gallery). Roughly half of The War Artists is devoted to the artists of the Second World War, and constitutes the first substantial analysis of the WAAC. However, the authors relied, in their research, almost entirely upon the archives of the Department of Art of the Imperial War Museum. This is certainly the most extensive of archival collections dealing with the WAAC, but it is not the only one, and the completeness and balance of the Harries' account suffers accordingly. In addition, their decision to organise most of their text into chapters devoted to individual artists, branches of the Armed Services or government ministries has resulted an excellent framework for an overview of the variety of subjects undertaken by the war artists, but has put severe limits on the amount of attention that can be paid to the formation, internal organisation, policies, and publishing- and exhibition-related activities of the Committee, to say nothing of the more subtle issues of propaganda and patronage.

The War Artists remains, despite certain shortcomings, the most complete and balanced published history of the WAAC. The only other book about the Committee, Alan Ross' The Colours of War: War Art 1939-45 (London: Jonathon Cape, 1983), makes comparatively little use of archival material. Ross brings to his writing the qualities of a thoughtful critic and observer of the wartime scene, and his book includes a number of insightful comments. However his text, each chapter of which is based on the work of one or more artists, is not a well-documented analytical study.

The other post-war authors who have written about the WAAC have done so either very briefly or in passing. Kenneth Clark wrote a few hundred words about it in the second volume of his autobiography (The Other Half: A Self-Portrait; London: John Murray, 1977). Only three exhibition catalogues that deal with the WAAC in more than a half-dozen pages have appeared since 1946. Neither of the first two (Memorial Exhibition: The War Artists (Folkestone: New Metropole Arts Centre, 1964), and British Artists of the Second World War (Arts Council of Great Britain, 1965)) have substantial texts, although both include useful information. In honour of the fiftieth anniversary of the beginning of the War, the Tate Gallery in Liverpool published World War II in 1989 to accompany an exhibition of pictures acquired from the WAAC by the Tate Gallery in London. Penelope Curtis' catalogue essay is a useful introduction to the WAAC and the activities of the war artists, but at six

pages it is no more than a prologue, and includes a few errors.<sup>7</sup>

Although of importance in the emergence of government support for art in Britain, the WAAC also tends to get short shrift in histories of official patronage. John S. Harris, for example (in his 1970 study Government Patronage of the Arts in Great Britain (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1970), devotes some seventeen pages (pp.19-36) to the War years. Of this total the WAAC is given one-half of a page; the Entertainments National Service Association (ENSA) receives three, while the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA) gets eleven. Even the mere half-page given over to the WAAC includes errors of fact or emphasis.<sup>8</sup> The subject of war art is also usually absent from detailed histories of the British home front (by authors such as Norman Longmate, E.S. Turner and Arthur Marwick<sup>9</sup>), although war art was readily available in exhibitions and as reproductions. Even Angus Calder, in his sweeping study The People's War: Britain, 1939-1945 (London/Toronto/Sydney/New York: Granada, 1982) devotes only one of more than 650 pages (p.589) to the work of the Committee, underestimates the total number of artists involved by almost 20%, and exaggerates the WAAC's 1939-1940 budget by a factor of two.

In the comparatively few post-war texts that mention the WAAC at all, errors are common. They range from permutations on the name of the Committee, to confusion about the meaning

of the term "official war artist,"<sup>10</sup> and to more common errors of statistics. The total number of works produced for the Committee was closer to 6000 than to 15,000, which is the inflated number given by Boris Ford (ed., The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 9: Since the Second World War), as well as by William Feaver and others. Kenneth Clark himself claimed in his autobiography that the WAAC accumulated 10,000 works of art.<sup>11</sup> Even W.P. Mayes' A Concise Catalogue of Paintings, Drawings and Sculpture of the Second World War, 1939-1945 (London: Imperial War Museum, 1964; 2nd edition) suffers from a number of omissions and duplications among its entries - particularly on pages 241-246. Elsewhere in the text the author makes no attempt to distinguish between art acquired by the WAAC, and contemporary works acquired independently by the IWM. As a result, progress could not be made on the present thesis until all of the artworks that came into the possession of the WAAC had been identified and located, and their provenance established with certainty.

Approximately half-a-century has passed since the formation of the War Artists' Advisory Committee and, six years later, the Arts Council of Great Britain. The latter owes its organisation in no small part to the lessons learned by the WAAC about ongoing state support of the fine arts, even if it is more institutionally identified with the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts. Yet the work of the WAAC continues to be underestimated and misunderstood. This thesis,

by grounding the Committee within the socio-economic context for contemporary art on the one hand, and the intersection of government patronage and propaganda on the other, seeks to shed some belated light on an organisation that, in its day, was widely recognised as an important and controversial one.

### Introduction: Endnotes

1. Colin Coote, "Introduction," in Arts Council of Great Britain, British Artists of the Second World War (Great Britain: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1965), n.p.

2. For example: Geoff Hurd, ed. National Fictions: World War Two in British Film and Television (London: British Film Institute Publishing, 1984).

3. Letter to the author from Nigel Frank, Contemporary Art Society, 19 May 1987.

4. Angus Calder, The People's War: Britain 1939-45 (London/Toronto/Sydney/New York: Granada Publishing Limited, 1971), pp.649-650.

5. Supporting documentation, dated October 1948, is filed in GP/55/28.

6. Imperial War Museum: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: Lord Clark, OM, CH, KCB, C Lit, FBA (tape-recorded interview; accession #4778/02). The interview was conducted by Julian Andrews.

7. For example, she erroneously states that the Ministry of Supply and the Ministry of War Transport had representatives at the first meeting of the WAAC (23 November 1939), and that the Committee acquired work from 300 artists (the true number being 405).

8. The Committee was not (as Harris writes) constituted with the partial aim of giving advice on the purchase of art for the national art collections. Nor was the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts the sole organisation involved in the circulation of selections from the WAAC collection to provincial galleries and museums during the War.

9. Longmate, How We Lived Then: A History of Everyday Life During the Second World War (London: Hutchinson of London, 1971); Longmate, The Home Front: An Anthology of Personal Experience, 1938-1945 (London: Chatto & Windus, 1981); Turner, The Phoney War on the Home Front (London: Michael Joseph, 1961); Marwick, The Home Front (London: Thames & Hudson, 1976). Longmate does include two paragraphs on the WAAC in How We Lived Then (pp.452-453), but does not mention any of the exhibitions of its war pictures.

10. The WAAC used the title "official war artist" only in connection with the artists to whom it gave full-time contracts to work for the War Office, Air Ministry, Admiralty,



Ministry of War Transport, or Ministry of Information. Only thirty-seven artists were employed in this way (i.e., 9% of all artists whose work was acquired by the Committee).

11. Ford's book was published in Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne and Sydney by the Cambridge University Press, in 1988. Feaver's text, "Wartime Romances," appeared in The Sunday Times Magazine on 20 May 1973, pp.74-85. Clark's reference to 10,000 works of art is on p.24 of The Other Half.



### Artists and Unemployment

The 1930's were years of extreme severity of unemployment for certain sectors of the work force. The poverty and the sense of entrapment generated by the decade were chronicled by Walter Greenwood (Love on the Dole, 1933), Ellen Wilkinson (The Town that was Murdered, 1936) and George Orwell (The Road to Wigan Pier, 1937). Unemployment stagnated at above two million from 1931 to 1935, peaking at just short of three million (of a total insured work force of some twelve million) during the winter of 1932-1933. John Hilton (Professor of Industrial Relations at Cambridge University) estimated in 1944 that, during the 1930's, 17% of families spent their entire incomes on essentials, while another 51% enjoyed total assets worth £100 or less.<sup>3</sup>

Yet cyclical unemployment resulting from the Depression had its principal impact upon the entire British economy only during the years from 1929 to 1934; the average real standard of living for those who had work actually rose, by between 15% and 18% over the course of the entire decade.<sup>4</sup> Long-term unemployment tended to be chronic only for the minority of the work force that was localised geographically and in terms of types of employment. The hardest-hit industries were ship-building, coal mining and textile production, and the parts of the country that suffered the most were those in which these industries dominated the local economies: northern England (13.8% unemployment), Scotland (15.9%), Wales (22.3%) and

Northern Ireland (23.6%).<sup>5</sup>

These temporal and geographical factors had their impacts upon artist's livelihoods. According to the 1931 census some 15,925 individuals in England and Wales described themselves as artists, while the comparable total for Scotland was 942.<sup>6</sup> (In 1944 the Central Institute of Art and Design suggested that "not less than 30,000 [...people] depend for their livelihood on some form or forms of art activity."<sup>7</sup>) Of the 15,925 artists in England and Wales in 1931, some 6.1% stated that they were out of work. Among the Scottish artists, 4.1% claimed to be unemployed. However, it was elsewhere estimated by contemporary writers that, of all the artists in the country who were employed during the 1930's, only about seven hundred painters and thirty sculptors (4.3% of the total) had a sufficient income from making art to survive on it alone.<sup>8</sup> A 1936 study of the employment status of graduates of the Royal College of Art reported that those respondents who had obtained work in some art-related field often found themselves doing menial jobs incommensurate with their training, and for unsatisfactory salaries. The study concluded that the average artist "has far less chance of maintaining himself ... than the average secondary schoolboy who passes his 'matric'."<sup>9</sup>

By the end of the 1930's, however, with world trade recovering, the outlook was better. According to a 1939 Board of Education report on employment amongst graduates of the RCA,

Of the 207 students who left the College

in the summers of 1936 and 1937 59 [28.5%] are known to have taken full-time teaching posts and 34 [16.4%] part-time ones; 19 [9.2%] obtained appointments as practising artists either in industry or in some other sphere; 20 [9.7%] were working on their own account either on commissions or as free-lances. Of the remaining 75 [36.2%] little or nothing has been heard, but this does not necessarily mean that they are without employment.<sup>10</sup>

However, the economic recovery of the later 1930's and its favourable effect on many areas of employment was crushed by the declaration of war in September 1939. "Every institution helped to stagnate itself by suffering a sort of psychological collapse at the outbreak of war," was the entirely justified complaint of Mass-Observation.<sup>11</sup> Management in industry reacted sluggishly and unimaginatively to the changed circumstances until at least the end of 1940, much as it had in 1914. Expectation of widespread destruction, and the anticipation of the loss of labour, raw materials and public demand, resulted in massive job cuts throughout most sectors of the economy. Employers then reoriented their businesses to wartime production needs and, only when this had been done, re-engaged employees. During the first six months of the War the total number of workers who lost their peacetime jobs actually exceeded the number absorbed into war-related employment. The unemployment rate did not begin to decline until March 1940. Even by then the number of people working in the munitions industries was only 11% higher than it had been in September

1939, whereas Churchill calculated that a 66% increase was needed.<sup>12</sup>

Few professional groups suffered from this economic confusion in the early days of the War as severely as did artists. A survey taken by the Artists' International Association in late September and/or early October 1939 indicated that 73% of respondents had lost their jobs or had had commissions cancelled since the beginning of September.<sup>13</sup> Among them were many who were barred from voluntary enlistment in the Armed Services because they were working (nominally or otherwise) in reserved occupations. (They included draughtsmen, jewellery designers and modellers, and designers and modellers of gold, silver, white metal or plated ware, who were thirty years of age or older, and cartographers and full-time art teachers aged twenty-five years or older.<sup>14</sup>) Kenneth Clark estimated that some eight or nine thousand artists lost their jobs between the beginning of September and mid-November, and even that figure did not include industrial designers. It was with no exaggeration that Mass-Observation, in a review of September and October 1939, could claim that during those two months "Art Production and Consumption practically ceased."<sup>15</sup> Vera Brittain, interviewing potential escorts for children being evacuated to Canada in the spring of 1940, noted, "Before we had interviewed applicants for a week, we could make a long list of the civilised forms of employment connected with amusement, travel, music, art, journalism and

the stage, which have been slaughtered by the grim inexorability of war."<sup>16</sup> Commenting on the variance between pre- and post-conscription prospects for financial security, of an artist whose resources and attitudes were identified as being fairly typical in this regard, a 1939 writer was "astonished to note the change in [...his] spirits after a fortnight's life in camp. Two weeks of artillery-drill have cheered him up no end!"<sup>17</sup>

If the outlook during the first year was grim for those who had held full- or part-time jobs before September 1939, the prospect for freelance artists and designers was even worse. Companies and private businesses went bankrupt, operated on reduced scales, or suspended activities indefinitely after necessary materials were diverted to the war effort. Other businesses suffered a decline in customer demand coincident with the advent of war economy measures, general uncertainty about the future, and the loss of markets abroad.<sup>18</sup> Matters had been exacerbated by the post-Munich influx of refugee artists, who were suspected by many of dumping their work on a structurally unprepared British art market. In addition, an entry visa could be issued only if the recipient had already been guaranteed a job, and this led the Royal Society of British Sculptors, for example, to oppose the employment of refugee artists who were already present in Britain.<sup>19</sup>

Even though artists' unemployment rates were high in 1939

and 1940, their overall financial situation was less desperate than it had been at the beginning of the First World War. The 1934 Unemployment Insurance Act had raised the number of people eligible for unemployment payments (to some 15.4 million by 1938), and had credited secondary school students with ten contributory payments per year while they were at school, thus ensuring that as of September 1935 those leaving school after the age of fourteen years were eligible for benefits as soon as they began work. This was an obvious advantage for artists whose first jobs (as was often the case) were part-time or temporary ones in which they could not hope to make the otherwise requisite number of contributory payments to become eligible for unemployment benefits. The Unemployment Insurance Act had also abolished a previous restriction that assistance could only be given to those who had not left their most recent jobs voluntarily, who had not been dismissed for misconduct, or who had not refused to accept a job because they had considered it unsuitable. Artists were thus less constrained to accept or stay in jobs which had no relevance to their interests or abilities, simply in order to keep from disqualifying themselves for financial assistance.<sup>20</sup>

Artists, along with the rest of the population, also benefited from the Courts (Emergency Powers) Act (September 1939), which forbade creditors to enforce payment of debts or obligations (including rent and mortgage payments) incurred before 1 September, without first obtaining permission from



the Courts.<sup>21</sup> In addition, on 8 September authorisation was given to the Unemployment Assistance Board "to pay allowances to people in distress owing to circumstances arising out of the war even if they are not within the ordinary Unemployment scheme."<sup>22</sup> Rates of payment were calculated on the same scales as the unemployment assistance allowances, with the same consideration taken of the needs of the applicant and of his or her dependents. To be eligible, a claimant was required to be over sixteen years of age and to be in distress either because of having been evacuated or because "he or she, or the person on whom he or she is normally dependent for support, has been deprived entirely or to a substantial extent of his or her normal means of livelihood by circumstances arising out of the war." (However, actually proving that one had a right to this emergency relief could be difficult. As a committee concerned with the wartime unemployment of artists commented near the end of 1939, "In administering a provision so wide in its scope, the Unemployment Assistance Board naturally feel it necessary to take a very strict view of what constitutes distress.")<sup>23</sup>

Of course, the very nature of the Second World War as a "total" war also required the mobilisation of virtually the entire able-bodied population (except those who were excused on the grounds of age, health or urgent family responsibilities, or because they were already doing work of national importance) into the Armed Services, Civil Defence work, or

other types of employment directly related to the war effort. In this sense able-bodied artists did not need to fear long-term unemployment occasioned by the War. Their concern, especially after mid-1940, was less with finding employment per se than with finding "appropriate" employment. This chapter sketches a broad overview of the degree to which the onset of the War disrupted the financial status of British artists as a whole. Specific attention is given to art teachers, commercial artists, designers, and artists who sold their art at commercial galleries and society exhibitions, or who worked on commission.

### Art Teachers

A large number of artists, including several of the official war artists, and many more from whom work was purchased or commissioned by the War Artists' Advisory Committee, earned at least a partial living not by making art, but by teaching it.<sup>24</sup> For example, in the mid-1930's at the Royal College of Art (and despite the latter's original mandate to train designers for work in industry), fully 25% of the students were enrolled in the pedagogy programme and "a large number" of other students who took only the Diploma course also found their way into full-time teaching jobs.<sup>25</sup>

The number of full-time art teachers employed by the Board of Education seems to have been quite stable over the

course of the decade that began in c.1937. In 1937-1938, 635 such teachers were employed in the approximately 220 art schools and colleges accredited by the Board.<sup>26</sup> This figure compares to approximately 600 full-time art teachers recorded in c.1944, and 624 as of 31 March 1947.<sup>27</sup> In addition, towards the end of the War some 600 to 700 full-time art teachers were working in secondary schools.<sup>28</sup> Teachers' job security was owed in part to the fact that the age of reservation for full-time male teachers was kept below the age of reservation for the general population,<sup>29</sup> and in part to the work of both the Board of Education and the Council for Art and Industry in publicising and promoting the idea that art education served a vital purpose both during and immediately after the War. It was under these circumstances that the wartime students at the Royal College of Art turned increasingly to pedagogical studies. One in five of the 1938 graduates of the RCA had specialised in teacher training, whereas during the War a clear majority were working towards becoming teachers.<sup>30</sup>

However, comparably optimistic statistics cannot be cited for the Board's part-time teachers. Even before the War there had been an over-supply of candidates for part-time teaching positions. Their numbers had been further swelled by practising artists (lacking formal pedagogical qualifications), who had been increasingly favoured by the pre-war hiring policies (encouraged by the 1932 Gorell Committee's report to the Council for Art and Industry) of such employers as the London

County Council. The larger conurbations in particular were flooded with artists vying for the estimated 2100-2500 part-time positions that existed in art and technical schools. "The perpetual scramble for [part-time teaching] jobs," observed one writer shortly before the War, "no doubt adds a stimulus to existence."<sup>31</sup>

Most job losses suffered by art teachers during the Second World War were due first to school closures and later to low student enrolment, and were borne primarily by part-time teachers. The initial job losses occurred right at the beginning of the War, when art schools that were located in evacuation and neutral areas (as opposed to the comparatively underpopulated reception areas) obeyed a directive to suspend operations. ("The wholesale slaughter of the art-schools on the outbreak of war equals many of Hitler's bloodless victories," protested Gilbert Spencer.<sup>32</sup>) As early as 16 September the Board of Education opted to ease the prohibition on the reopening of schools in evacuation areas, subject to the schools complying with air raid precaution regulations;<sup>33</sup> but in London, by the first week of November, only five of the nineteen technical and commercial London County Council institutes in the metropolitan area were open, and only fifty of the 180 LCC institutes in the capital as a whole.<sup>34</sup> Local education authorities estimated that, by December 1939, three-fifths of their courses were in operation throughout the country, although in London the figure was only one-third.<sup>35</sup> In

July 1941, one year after the Battle of Britain had begun, the Central Institute of Art and Design reported that only three art schools were open for day classes in London: the Polytechnic School of Art, St. Martin's School of Art, and Goldsmiths' College School of Art.<sup>36</sup> At technical and secondary schools in which art was only one subject among many, reopenings<sup>to</sup> was frequently followed by a restriction of the syllabus to "fundamental" subjects. As a result, in some cases art classes were scaled down or eliminated altogether.<sup>37</sup>

In May 1940 the Prime Minister emphasised plans to do "all that is possible to encourage art education despite the difficulties inevitably created by the war."<sup>38</sup> Yet, although most Board of Education schools had reopened within eight to ten months of their 1939 closure, and although destruction of art schools rarely resulted in prolonged or severe disruption of activities,<sup>39</sup> this was good news only for full-time faculties. To hope to justify rehiring part-time teachers, art schools would have required enrolment levels comparable to those of the 1938-1939 school year, and this was thwarted by the pre-war dominance of part-time students. In 1934 and 1935, for example, it had been estimated by the Council for Art and Industry that between only 9.2% and 13.8% of art students were in full-time attendance.<sup>40</sup> According to a study conducted in late 1937, a mere 9.8% of students at Board of Education art schools in London (excluding junior art departments) were full-time.<sup>41</sup> In 1937, evening institutes throughout England

and Wales offered a total of 1975 classes in fine art and crafts for 44,075 students,<sup>42</sup> almost all of whom were part-time.

Once the War had begun, it was this huge part-time student population that plummeted the most dramatically. Students had evening commitments to such Civil Defence duties as fire-watching.<sup>43</sup> Travelling at night during the blackout was also hazardous, and was made worse (especially beginning in mid-1940) by restricted or disrupted public transportation. The Poole Art School, representative in this regard of other institutions, enrolled 114 evening students in 1938, 104 in 1939, and only 68 in 1940.<sup>44</sup> Of the fifty London County Council institutes that were open in the first week of November 1939, few had managed to attract their quotas of students.<sup>45</sup> The Polytechnic of Central London had 573 students in 1938-1939, but only 353 in 1939-1940, and 231 in 1940-1941.<sup>46</sup> At the Royal College of Art (closed in the autumn of 1939 and reopened in January 1940), enrolment fell from 334 in 1937-1938, to 142 in 1941-1942, and to 92 in 1943-1944, rising slightly to 112 in 1944-1945.<sup>47</sup> Part-time teachers who had once been responsible for daytime classes lost them to full-time staff when overflow courses were cancelled. This happened at the Hornsey School of Art, for example, in 1940, when the student population fell to only 17% of its 1938 level and the Principal rescinded the contracts of all part-time teachers employed to conduct fewer than five classes per week.<sup>48</sup> In

addition, wage-earners who were pursuing evening training for what were projected to be second careers, reconsidered their options as the War slashed employment opportunities in such fields as craftwork, painting and decorating, printing, and architecture.<sup>49</sup>

To combat unemployment amongst teachers, a group of art organisations recommended in 1939 that teachers in areas where it was impractical to recommence classes might be transferred to schools located in reception areas.<sup>50</sup> For its part the Ministry of Labour's Committee on the Employment of Artists in War-time<sup>1</sup> recommended (also in 1939) that the pre-war Board of Education regulation eliminating classes with low registration should be administered "with great latitude" during the War. It further suggested that art classes should be maintained wherever possible, on the basis of the positive psychological effect of encouraging students to continue their studies.<sup>51</sup> There was also a certain amount of concern expressed that art was an essential field of study because of the perceived need for inculcating the broad-minded, generous attitudes (for the post-war reconstruction period) that many associated with the arts.<sup>52</sup> These ideas, promoted in the early weeks of the War, were intended to encourage the employment of art teachers in general. After mid-1940, with full-time teachers being re-engaged in substantial numbers, employment schemes were directed increasingly at part-time teachers in particular.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter 2.

Yet even had art schools ignored their enrolment levels and attempted to rehire part-time faculty members, they would have come into conflict with the Ministry of Labour's plans for mass mobilisation of the population. The Ministry could hardly be expected to be sympathetic to any proposal that the 2100-2500 part-time teachers (60% of whom had taught for fewer than six hours per week even before September 1939<sup>53</sup>) should have their jobs protected. The Board of Education accordingly decided at the end of 1939 that, even if attendance at evening classes should increase, the number of part-time instructors re-engaged by the schools in 1940 would not be allowed to keep pace with student enrolment.<sup>54</sup> Employing large numbers of part-time instructors (even those too old to be conscripted) would result in criticism of the Board by emergency committees and by economy officials in local authorities, and within a few weeks of the declaration of war the Board announced that in every part of the country "large numbers" of part-time teachers had not been re-engaged for the 1939-1940 school year.<sup>55</sup> Nor were they rehired before 1945-1946. It therefore comes as no surprise to discover that, among the hundreds of artists who requested work from the War Artists' Advisory Committee in 1939 and 1940, many (including Rosemary Allan, J.C. Armitage, Allan Gwynne-Jones, Morris Kestelman and William Roberts) were former part-time art teachers.



### Commercial Artists and Illustrators

Although the WAAC tended to favour "fine" artists when it issued contracts, this does not indicate that commercial artists (or designers; see next section) did not benefit from the Committee's patronage. The separation of fine art, commercial art and design into three separate spheres is in large part a post-war phenomenon; the economic need for versatility in crossing the amorphous dividing lines between these pursuits during the 1930's is evident in the careers of many of the men and women supported by the WAAC. For example, although the Committee acquired work from only a few full-time commercial artists (including Abram Games and B.J. Cumming), it awarded several of its contracts to artists (like John Armstrong, Charles Cundall, Barnett Freedman and Eric Kennington) who earned part of their livelihood through the practice of commercial art. Similarly, among the WAAC artists who earned income as designers (of furniture, textiles, ceramics, glassware, jewellery, metalwork and so forth) were Edward Bawden, Frank Dobson, Duncan Grant, Raymond McGrath and Anna Zinkeisen.

The number of individuals making their livings as commercial artists in the late 1930's is only vaguely known, and even the numbers of artists working for large publishing or publicity houses can rarely be determined with exactitude.<sup>56</sup> In 1939 the Chairman of a Ministry of Labour committee sup-

posed that there were roughly 1200 to 1500 commercial artists who did not supplement their income by doing subsidiary work as designers.<sup>57</sup> Three years earlier the Council for Art and Industry had estimated that there were 3000 artists in Britain engaged in the preparation of advertisements.<sup>58</sup> (At that time there were approximately 1000 advertising agencies in the country, of which roughly one-tenth had more than fifty clients.<sup>59</sup>) Approximately fifteen to thirty-five full-time artists were employed by each of the larger agencies (such as W.S. Crawford Ltd., Stuarts, J. Walter Thompson, and London Press Exchange), each of which also gave sporadic contract work to some fifty freelance artists for whose particular skills demand was not sufficiently high to justify their employment on a full-time basis. It was estimated by the Dartington Hall Trustees, in their contemporary study of the visual arts in Britain, that in 1938 approximately £700,000 was paid to artists for their work in press advertising campaigns.<sup>60</sup> Advertising analyst F.P. Bishop proposed a total of £6,000,000 for artists', writers' and consultants' fees from press advertising in 1938.<sup>61</sup>

The beginning of the War had an immediate and deleterious effect on the advertising industry. Art departments laid off salaried staff "on a wholesale scale." The Central Institute of Art and Design responded to the crisis by establishing its own Poster Section to act as a clearinghouse for unemployed commercial artists.<sup>62</sup> By the end of November 70% of commercial

artists were thought to be unemployed.<sup>63</sup> The National Institute of Economic and Social Research estimated that display advertising accounted for 23.7% of newspaper revenue in 1935, but only 12.9% in 1943.<sup>64</sup> A 1944 study of the sums spent to advertise a variety of consumer items in nine broad product categories indicated that the total budget for the products under consideration had shrunk from £21,322,084 in 1938 to slightly more than £18,000,000 in 1939, to £12,858,497 in 1940, and to £9,410,903 in 1942. The latter total was only 45% of the 1938 figure.<sup>65</sup> Whereas the immediate pre-war total for yearly advertising of all types had been approximately £90,000,000, the figure for 1943 was only £35,000,000-£40,000,000.<sup>66</sup> However, there was some compensation in the fact that the two wartime governments, and the Ministry of Information in particular, soon became the most important sources of employment, the government spending some £9,500,000 on advertising between March 1940 and June 1945.<sup>67</sup> On a smaller scale, private businesses gradually became more willing than they had been in 1939-1940 to spend money on artwork, following the introduction of an excess profits tax which made large end-of-year profits less enticing than they would otherwise have been.<sup>68</sup>

Aside from advertising, commercial artists and illustrators before the War had earned money doing book and periodical illustration. The publishing of limited edition illustrated books in the 1930's by private presses, primarily as collec-

tors' items, had failed to maintain the momentum gathered during the preceding decade; yet companies such as the Gregynog Press and the Golden Cockerel Press survived to produce limited edition illustrated books of exceptional quality during the 1930's. Perpetua Press in Bristol, and Viscount Carlown's Corvinus Press (established in the mid-1930's) also commissioned interesting work. Most private presses, however, failed to survive the economic straits of the Depression at the beginning of the decade, and the Gregynog, Perpetua and Corvinus were all killed by the War. (The only private press of any significance to continue production throughout the War was the Golden Cockerel.) Their places were taken by a proliferation of commercial companies such as the Nonesuch Press and the Curwen Press. These businesses convincingly reoriented illustrated publications away from expensive limited editions, and towards inexpensive editions, both limited and otherwise. In addition, whereas the private presses had tended to favour wood engravings (and therefore specialist and highly original wood engravers) almost exclusively, the commercial presses regularly employed artists and designers skilled in other media. Edward Ardizzone, Marion Dorn, John Farleigh, Barnett Freedman, Eric Gill, Stephen Gooden, Anthony Gross, Gertrude Hermes, Blair Hughes-Stanton, E. McKnight Kauffer, Clare Leighton, R.A. Maynard, John and Paul Nash, Eric Ravillious, Leonard Rosoman, Albert Rutherston and Rex Whistler were only the best-known of the artists employed by publishing houses

throughout the 1930's. A reviewer writing at mid-decade felt justified in making the claim (albeit overstated) that "the revival of illustration is one of the most notable features of modern book production. Not since the days of Cruikshank have English publishers commanded so varied and numerous a band of artists whose work accords with type."<sup>69</sup>

The War put an end to this trend. In April 1940 the government announced that books would henceforth be subject to paper rationing, with allocations to each publisher being set at 60% of his or her total consumption over the twelve months ending in August 1939. This was the principal reason for the disappearance of richly-illustrated gift books. (175 new titles in this category were published in 1939, 113 in 1940, 39 in 1941, 26 in 1942, and 38 in 1943.<sup>70</sup>) Further, in a single night (29-30 December 1940), the London community of publishers was devastated in a raid that destroyed Paternoster Row and the surrounding streets, and in the process demolished or severely damaged the premises of Eyre and Spottiswoode, Hamilton & Kent, Hutchinson's, Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd., Marshall Simpkin, Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ward Lock, Whitaker's, William Collins & Sons, and others.<sup>71</sup> Under the combination of these trying circumstances illustrated books continued to appear, although most companies seem to have published fewer than 10% as many such books in the six years 1939-1945 as they had produced over the six years immediately before the War.<sup>72</sup>

In magazine publishing, the dominance of photography had

been a factor of importance during the 1930's. Despite having to compete with other magazines and media, the publishers of Picture Post were printing 1,000,000 copies of each issue by December 1938 (only two months after the magazine's appearance), and 1,300,000 within four.<sup>73</sup> However, the success enjoyed by Picture Post was balanced by the continuing demand for periodicals, such as Lilliput, The Sphere and The Illustrated London News, that relied either partly or almost entirely upon illustrators rather than photographers. Immediately before the War, for example, an artist could make thirty guineas if his or her work was selected for exclusive full-page reproduction in The Tatler.<sup>74</sup>

Such employment prospects worsened after September 1939, and especially after the introduction of paper rationing, and the onset of aerial bombardment. Signature, for example, which had published illustrations by many artists during the 1930's, had its offices destroyed during the Battle of Britain. Yet illustrators could thrive if they were sufficiently adaptable. Dennis Flanders' work on a series of drawings for The Sunday Times was cut short by the War,<sup>75</sup> but his fondness for making closely-observed line drawings of bombed buildings ensured him of other contracts beginning in mid-1940, and of sales to the WAAC. Bryan de Grineau, G.H. Davis, E. Byatt and C.E. Turner of The Illustrated London News, and Terence Cuneo at both The ILN and Picture Post, turned their talents to drawing dramatic reconstructions of important actions and battles for which

photographs were not available. Cuneo's dramatic drawings of the machinery of war found a ready public not only in the readers of The ILN and Picture Post, but also in those who purchased his booklet Tanks and How to Draw Them, written and illustrated as part of a series of topical "how-to" books published by The Studio.<sup>76</sup> Frank Wootton's skill at drawing and painting airplanes earned him commissions from aircraft manufacturers wishing to record war work being done in their factories.<sup>77</sup> Towards the end of the War an unidentified group of publishers that owned four semi-pictorial monthly and two big weekly periodicals, was paying £20,000 per year to artists for original illustrations. One member of this group was paying approximately twenty artists £300 apiece per year for illustrations for weekly publications, as well as spending £2400 yearly on illustrations for monthly publications. A particularly hard-working freelance illustrator was estimated to be capable of earning up to £2000 per year.<sup>78</sup> Opportunities for commercial artists and illustrators, though less frequent in occurrence than they had been during the 1930's, were thus not obliterated by the War.

### Designers

Artists' and professional designers' interest in industry was encouraged during the 1920's and 1930's by contemporary theorising about the need for them to become more fully inte-

grated within society. In addition, the damage done by the international Depression, to overseas demand for British-designed goods bolstered the perception that the balance of trade could be improved if the design quality of export merchandise could be improved.<sup>79</sup> Further, the introduction of hire-purchase schemes for a broad range of household wares had contributed to the expansion of the market for consumer goods, as had the development of large department stores, the spread of chain stores, and the use of increasingly sophisticated techniques of mass production, advertising and promotion. Marks and Spencer alone had opened or extended 258 stores by 1939.<sup>80</sup> Public lectures and lecture series, on the subject of industrial design, were sponsored by the BBC (Design in Modern Life, 1933), the Design and Industries Association, the Society of Industrial Artists, and other groups. The 1930's also witnessed the appearance of several books, periodicals and exhibitions focusing on design, as well as public awareness campaigns conducted by design interest groups.<sup>81</sup> "We now live in an age when durability is no longer of prime importance....," wrote Geoffrey Holme (of The Studio) in 1931, "and we live also in an age when such an embarrassment of goods is within the reach of the purchasing public - goods not widely different in quality or price - that attractiveness of design or colour becomes the important factor in the decision as to which are chosen."<sup>82</sup>

1930's student enrolment statistics indicated a favour-



able response to all of these exhortations, organisations and activities. 38.9% of the art students in Board of Education schools in 1937-1938 were in courses dealing with some branch of design. In London, slightly more than half (51.2%) of students in art classes were studying design.<sup>83</sup> Yet despite all this interest, qualified designers, looking for salaried, freelance or consultant work, were not necessarily embraced by industry during the decade preceding the Second World War. Contemporaries debating who was to blame for such a state of affairs and what could be done to improve upon it offered a wealth of contradictory assertions.<sup>84</sup> Confusion and contradiction aside, there seem to have been four principal reasons why the relationship between art and industry was a tentative and rocky one: the shortcomings that existed in the training given to prospective designers;<sup>85</sup> limitations in manufacturers' needs for quantities of quality design;<sup>86</sup> poor conditions (especially salaries) in industry;<sup>87</sup> and disputes that arose between designers and manufacturers about the mechanics of merging art with industry.<sup>88</sup> Other factors, such as the existence of several groups rather than one central controlling body for the promotion of good design in industry, exacerbated the situation.

Yet the situation was not hopeless. In the year ending in April 1939, for example, a total of fifty-eight firms had asked the National Register of Industrial Art Designers (established by the Board of Trade in 1936) to recommend good

freelances, and 183 designers' names had been forwarded in response to these requests.<sup>89</sup> The Federation of British Industries also operated an Employment Bureau for industrial and commercial artists that (immediately before the War) was being used by hundreds of companies, and that was finding jobs for fifty to eighty students per year.<sup>90</sup> However, the often shaky partnership between art and industry militated against the ability of designers to establish themselves firmly within industry during the years immediately preceding the Second World War, and thus weakened their positions once war had been declared.

Individuals and organisations concerned with ensuring some degree of wartime job security for designers, and as little disruption as possible for the profession, tended to focus their attention on foreign trade|. This area had been somewhat neglected by the government during the First World War, with unfortunate but inevitable results for post-war trading credibility.<sup>91</sup> By late 1939 the danger of repeating that error had been passively accepted by both the Board of Trade and the Department of Overseas Trade. Yet the latter had already cancelled industrial fairs, an action that threatened the health of the export trade (although it was also true that severe import-export restrictions made holding the fairs increasingly impracticable).<sup>92</sup> The cancellation of such exhibitions because of the War was a particularly harsh blow to designers (thought to constitute a majority<sup>93</sup>) who were not

employed by manufacturers, but who worked directly for the ultimate purchasers, and who relied upon trade shows to attract new clients. An attempt to obviate the problem created for designers by the cancellation of trade fairs was made in 1939 when a Ministry of Labour committee recommended the holding of a small exhibition of goods designed and manufactured in Britain.<sup>94</sup> The same committee suggested the stimulation of the sale of quality design products at home in response to the falling rate of unemployment, the consequent rise in the purchasing power of most of the population, and the need for designers and industry to supply goods previously imported from abroad.<sup>95</sup>

This initial optimism faded quickly. As Arnold Overton (Deputy Secretary of the Board of Trade) correctly anticipated in October 1939, designers were likely to find that most of the available work was in the export trade,<sup>96</sup> as shortages of raw materials necessitated the virtual curtailment of the luxury trade, and the introduction of standardised utility goods within Britain further reduced employment opportunities. On 5 September 1939, only two days after the declaration of war, the Ministry of Supply issued the Control of Timber (No. 1) Order, establishing Timber Control as a department under the Ministry's jurisdiction. This was followed by the creation of a number of similar departments for other, increasingly rare, materials: silk and rayon, leather, wool, cotton, iron and steel, aluminium, non-ferrous metals, flax, hemp and jute.

Surplus supplies of these materials were allocated to manufacturers on a ration system. Shortly thereafter certain industries were forbidden to make any products at all that were not in keeping with a very small number of Utility designs.<sup>97</sup> Only three people were responsible for most of the Utility furniture designs. In 1941 seven members of the incorporated society of London Fashion Designers were charged with designing all the basic models for women's clothing.<sup>98</sup>

Because Utility goods could be manufactured only by those with a Board of Trade licence to do so, independent companies soon found themselves unable to procure the raw materials they needed to stay in business. The Utility programme continued until 1952, much to the chagrin of such independent designer/manufacturers as David Joel.<sup>99</sup> Even if a company manufactured a product that was not regulated under the Utility programme there were no guarantees that limitations would not be imposed upon production. For example, the implementation of a law forbidding the manufacture of any decorated or "inessential" pottery for the home market necessarily resulted in decreased opportunities for employees at Wedgwood. The company responded with "Victory Ware" objects, all of which seem to have been designed by the company's Art Director, Victor Skeltern.<sup>100</sup>

Designers in 1939-1945 thus suffered not only from the effects of the weakness of their hold on pre-war industry, but also from government-imposed wartime restrictions. Nor were

they helped by the fact that the Schedule of Reserved Occupations did not include designers unless the latter held jobs as specialist draughtspersons in factories that were doing vital war production work.<sup>101</sup> How severely their ranks suffered war-time dislocation can only be approximated. Reliable statistics regarding the numbers of designers active even before the War are extremely scarce.<sup>102</sup> It was estimated in November 1939 by a Ministry of Labour committee that approximately 4000 full-time factory employees had been dependent to some degree upon design for their livelihoods as recently as the summer of 1939, and that 1000 of these could be described as "artists."<sup>103</sup> (The Dartington Hall Trustees made a comparable estimate of 800-900.<sup>104</sup>) Of the approximately 4000 individuals cited by the committee, fully one-third were unemployed in November, and 40% more suffered salary cuts during the same period.<sup>105</sup> Statistics were not kept for freelance designers, although the latter accounted for 60% of the 650 individuals enrolled by the National Register of Industrial Art Designers between its inception in 1936 and the outbreak of the War.<sup>106</sup> However, the heavy job losses suffered by full-time employees in industry bode ill for their freelance colleagues, who had not been well-utilised or supported by the manufacturing sector even in the pre-war years.

### Art Sales

As noted earlier, the quality of life for much of the employed British population improved fairly steadily during the 1930's, despite the impact of the Depression during the early years of the decade. Middle-class unemployment was only slightly increased by the localised economic vicissitudes of the years 1929-1939. A worldwide drop in the cost of primary products reduced the prices of imports and brought down the cost of living. Yet the art market remained weak and unstable throughout the decade. Prices were depressed even for works by the blue-chip schools and artists that had enjoyed a heavy demand before 1929.<sup>107</sup> The situation was particularly difficult outside of London's West End. The 1937 Manchester Academy spring exhibition, for example, opened with a plea on behalf of the local artists "who are having a thin time," and such entreaties seem to have been expressed fairly regularly at the Academy's shows.<sup>108</sup> In Liverpool, sales from the annual autumn exhibitions had by the second half of the 1930's "dwindled ... almost to the point of disappearance...."<sup>109</sup>

In the capital, sales at the 1929 London Artists' Association exhibition were good, but almost nothing was sold at the 1930 show and this marked the beginning of a decade-long trend.<sup>110</sup> Paul Nash earned only half as much from sales in 1931-1932 as he had in 1929-1930.<sup>111</sup> Ben Nicholson and Barbara Hepworth, despite critical praise for their work, were selling pieces for less in 1938 than they had in 1934.<sup>112</sup>

Fashionable portraitists continued to do well but, according to the Dartington Hall study, few unfashionable ("serious") artists earned more than £500 annually through sales and commissions.<sup>113</sup> Printmakers were particularly badly affected because they had depended heavily upon the now-collapsed American market. The limited-edition stenciled lithographs that had been a source of pride to the Curwen Press were unable to weather the times, and were not produced after 1932.<sup>114</sup> Graham Sutherland was only one artist who abandoned etching in the mid-1930's for economic reasons.<sup>115</sup> In the summer of 1939 Raymond Mortimer summarised what he characterised as a "violent" diminution in sales over the preceding years:

The cultivated patron who liked to spend anything between £20 and £500 per annum on pictures has been obliged to reduce or cancel this expenditure. The few who are being enriched by the manufacture of armaments, etc., do not seem to be the sort of persons that care about painting.<sup>116</sup>

James Boswell agreed, contending that immediately before the War most artists' groups "carried on through the generosity of the artists themselves," and that the public who went to the shows chose "to spend what money they have on other things than pictures."<sup>117</sup>

The beginning of the War had a severe impact on the already fragile state of art sales and commissions. Artists who lived abroad but who depended upon making sales in London were hurt by the almost immediate imposition of a ban on the im-

portation of pictures (although this restriction was to be greatly eased by the spring of 1940).<sup>118</sup> Air raids were expected, and this threat to personal property was an important factor in the further diminution of the market. As George B. Holland wrote in his 1939 application to the War Artists' Advisory Committee, "This war has cancelled my portrait commissions and appears to have completely ruined further possibilities...."<sup>119</sup> Frank Beresford, who had spent a career building a demand for his portraits of social luminaries, had work at hand during the first half of 1939, but by January 1940 he found that "everything was either 'put off' or cancelled & I'm just hoping I may hang on till the tide turns my way again."<sup>120</sup> Harold and Laura Knight, too, had difficulty selling work at this time, and Stanley Spencer's chaotic handling of his own finances was exacerbated by the sluggish market.<sup>121</sup>

In London, in September 1939, both P. & D. Colnaghi's and Wildenstein's had reacted to the War by suspending operations. The Cooling Galleries had attempted to revive business by slashing prices by 20%.<sup>122</sup> Yet, against widespread expectation, the bombs had not begun to fall. By November eight of the premiere West End institutions (the Leicester Galleries, Reid & Lefevre, P. & D. Colnaghi, Arthur Tooth & Sons, the Nicholson Gallery, the Stafford Gallery, the Fine Art Society and the Cooling Galleries) had publicised their intentions of remaining open.<sup>123</sup>



During the 1930's various galleries had sold the work of established and junior British artists.<sup>124</sup> Now galleries like Agnew's, the Leger Galleries, the Leicester Galleries and others were unwilling to risk keeping Old Masters and international modern art in London, and holding exhibitions of contemporary British art quickly became a popular activity. As Herbert Read wrote in November after making a tour of West End galleries, "There has seldom been such a good opportunity to obtain a general view of the state of contemporary painting in England."<sup>125</sup> Agnew's held a show of paintings by some sixty-five living artists at the end of 1939, and this was immediately followed by an exhibition at the Leicester Galleries of paintings by twenty-five artists, every picture having been produced specifically for the show and each one being priced at five guineas. Fifty per cent of the paintings were sold within the first fortnight. At the same time the Redfern Gallery had its walls hung with 175 paintings, drawings and prints, most of them contemporary English. Although a rumour that the Gallery made more money during one week of the exhibition than during any other week for years past was almost certainly an exaggeration, the experiment was nonetheless a marked success.<sup>126</sup> The Cooling Galleries subsequently found it worthwhile to stage twenty exhibitions of work by firemen artists (1941-1944), although few of the participants were at all well-known. In the summer of 1942 the Lefevre Gallery, the erstwhile purveyor of costly Ecole de Paris paintings, was the

site of an exhibition of works by the Ashington Group of amateur painters. Prospects were not consistently bright in 1939 and 1940, "before the moment of the war at which paintings suddenly became a symbol of the things for which we were supposed to be fighting," (as Julian Trevelyan later recalled).<sup>127</sup> It nonetheless seemed clear to many dealers that there was money to be made selling contemporary British art, and commentators marvelled at the plethora of resulting exhibitions that were staged even during the Battle of Britain and even in vulnerable coastal towns like Brighton.<sup>128</sup>

Growing interest in the work of living British artists paralleled not only the loss of access to contemporary art that had hitherto been imported from the Continent after the spring of 1940; it also reflected the wartime growth of interest in "serious" culture in general. As the freedom of British culture (as opposed to the perceived politicisation of the arts in Germany) came to symbolise the qualities of life that the War was being fought to protect, interest in literature, classical music, theatre and the visual arts became increasingly widespread. The BBC's drama ratings doubled between 1939 and 1941, while the success of The Brains Trust proved to the programme's delighted (but astounded) producer "that five men discussing philosophy, art and science, [could] have a regular audience of ten million listeners."<sup>129</sup> Novels like War and Peace became so popular that, despite reprintings, they were unobtainable by 1945. The London Philharmonic Orchestra and

the Old Vic Theatre Company enjoyed provincial tours that were far better-received than had been anticipated even as late as the autumn of 1939. Jack Lindsay, reviewing the popularity of "serious" art in 1945, was strongly impressed by the evident fact that, during the War, the British "have made an incalculable leap ahead, creating for the first time in England since folk-days a genuine mass-audience for drama, song, [and] music."<sup>130</sup>

The growth of this audience for the arts resulted in a change in the size and composition of the art-buying public itself. As the availability of traditional sources of expense (travel, clothing, food, etc.) diminished, and as unemployment declined (especially after 1940), personal incomes and savings rose.<sup>131</sup> (From 1938 to 1945 total personal income almost doubled, from £4890 million to £8440 million, while personal savings rose from £139 million to £920 million.<sup>132</sup> By 1945 virtually full employment, longer hours and bonus payments had resulted in average real earnings being fully 20% higher than they had been in 1938.<sup>133</sup>) Eric Newton and others had long decried the smallness of the constituency that commercial galleries had tended to address, and the combination of indifference and suspicion with which most people had seemed to approach them.<sup>134</sup> It was symptomatic of this that a 1941 survey of wartime novels revealed a tendency for the stories' villains to be art dealers.<sup>135</sup> In 1943, however, Newton described a typical member of the new art-buying public as being

generally younger than established collectors, and as being willing to make "an exhaustive tour of the dealers' galleries looking for a picture that he likes. He cares little for the reputation of the artist...." The new buyers, being of comparatively modest means, tended to favour small, inexpensive pictures.<sup>136</sup> They might have had what was described by several critics as "uneducated taste"; yet they gained support from such apparently unlikely sources as Apollo, which championed them in 1941 with an essay entitled "A Defence of the Philistine."<sup>137</sup> Kenneth Clark and others wrote articles in other periodicals encouraging people to overcome their feelings of confusion or even inferiority when faced with the prospect of visiting commercial galleries.<sup>138</sup>

All of this achieved the desired results. Beginning in 1941 newspapers, periodicals and the records of exhibiting societies began citing, with increasing frequency, impressive sales figures for contemporary art. In that year Henry Moore became one of the first artists to have his career firmly established by the War, when his Tube shelter drawings attracted a large enough buying public that for the first time his entire income derived from art sales.<sup>139</sup> Graham Bell was justified in claiming in October 1941 that English painting was flourishing "as it had not done since the gay boom years of the twenties":

Painters like Claude Rogers and Rodrigo Moynihan, who had been hovering for years on the edge of recognition, came into

their own with tremendously successful shows. Graham Sutherland's show at the Leicester Galleries sold right out, as did John Piper's, in the same gallery, [R.V.] Pitchforth and Morland Lewis did brilliantly well, Francis [sic; Frances] Hodgkins at the Lefevre Galleries better than ever before.<sup>140</sup>

The improved situation became particularly pronounced from c.1942, thus paralleling a similar trend in the art market at the mid-point of the First World War.<sup>141</sup> At its 1943 spring exhibition the Manchester Academy sold seventy works<sup>142</sup> - a significant success for an organisation that (as noted earlier) had tended to inaugurate its pre-war exhibitions with melancholy appeals on behalf of the many local artists who were unable to find buyers for their work. By the summer of 1943 visitors to shows in London's West End were reckoned by some gallery owners to be more numerous than ever before. "For the first time in the memory of people now alive," wrote a Daily Mail columnist (in 1943), "painters with unknown names are readily putting up their works in public auctions to be sold without reserve, and are almost always agreeably surprised with the outcome."<sup>143</sup> This trend was subsequently confirmed in other publications, including The Artist (September 1944), and The Studio (February 1945).<sup>144</sup>

The commercial galleries' successes were echoed, with remarkable consistency, in the sales statistics of exhibiting societies. Purchases at the Royal Academy's 1938 summer exhibition had totalled £11,929.11.0. Profits from the 1939 exhi-

bition (held just before the outbreak of war) reflected the troubled times: 188 works were sold, for £7736. Thereafter sales fell in 1940 (137 pieces, for £5200) before improving by leaps and bounds (152 works in 1941; 263 in 1942, although air raid damage at Burlington House cut the number of exhibits by half; and 416 - 40% of all the works on display - in 1943). The 1943 show was the most profitable since 1936, while that of 1945 was the most successful in a quarter-century. However, the average price paid for individual works in 1941-1943 was £28, a total well below the pre-war averages but entirely in keeping with the comparatively small sizes of the pictures and sculptures that constituted such a dominant part of the war-time art market.<sup>145</sup> The same tendencies are evident in statistics regarding the annual exhibitions held by (for example) the Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours<sup>146</sup> and the Royal Society of Painter-Etchers and Engravers:<sup>147</sup>

Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours

Exhibition	Attendance	Works Sold	
		Number	Value
Spring 1937	1472	49	£920.14.0
Autumn 1937	1406	39	£622.13.0
Spring 1938	1411	35	£538.01.0
Autumn 1938	760	28	£486.01.0
Spring 1939	649	24	£443.00.0
Autumn 1939	304	16	£207.18.0
Spring 1940	424	39	£654.01.0
Autumn 1940	no exhibition held in autumn 1940		
Spring 1941	260	19	£283.07.0 *
Autumn 1941	476	22	£309.15.0
Spring 1942	535	44	£724.14.0 *
Autumn 1942	615	45	£832.17.0
Spring 1943	544	69	£1158.10.6 *
Autumn 1943	783	81	£1402.07.0
Spring 1944	822	106	£2058.09.0 *
Autumn 1944	710	77	£1555.11.0
Spring 1945	814	88	£1718.19.0 *
Autumn 1945	1207	81	£1830.10.0
Spring 1946	904	71	£1398.13.0 *
Autumn 1946	783	62	£1509.05.0

\*Spring exhibitions for 1941 onwards were also sent to Sheffield after being seen in London.

-----

Royal Society of Painter-Etchers and Engravers

Exhibition	Attendance	Works Sold	
		Number	Value
1939	167	?	£131.16.6
1940	121	?	£206.10.6
1941	104	22	£67.04.0 <sup>2</sup>
1942	124	46	£153.19.6
1943	238	100	£311.16.6
1944	185	75	£258.10.6 <sup>3</sup>
1945	181	133	£470.10.6

-----

During the first year of the Second World War artists lost jobs or commissions, and saw their sales collapse. As a community they suffered severe and immediate dislocation. As time passed some of them (notably full-time art teachers, as well as artists selling their work) enjoyed a return to, or even an improvement upon, pre-war conditions. Examination of art sales statistics indicates that the War defied general prediction by not killing public interest in art. If anything,

---

<sup>2</sup> In addition to being sent to Sheffield, the 1941 exhibition went to Cheltenham and Manchester, where works to the value of £11.15.0 and £13.0.0, respectively, were sold. None were sold in Sheffield. 1941 seems to have been the only year in which the Society's exhibition was seen outside of London.

<sup>3</sup> The slump in attendance and sales in 1944 was explained by the Society as a direct result of the resumption of air raids shortly after the opening of the exhibition. Early attendance and sales had been greater than those of 1943, and the exhibition was, before the air raids began, expected to be the most profitable of the Society's wartime shows to date.



the closure of many public art galleries and museums, the increased affluence of a population benefiting from almost full employment, and what John Rothenstein called the "enhanced seriousness of the national temper"<sup>148</sup> broadened the audience and, after the Battle of Britain had ended, constituted the basis of a welcome (though largely unanticipated) demand for the work of contemporary British artists.

Yet, for many commercial artists, designers and part-time teachers, employment prospects were much less bright, and did not regain their pre-war condition until the restoration of peace in Europe. In the interim, the demands of essential production industries, Civil Defence and the Armed Services were capable of providing work and steady incomes to virtually every able-bodied artist whose time was not otherwise claimed. However, the conscription or voluntary enlistment of artists, designers and art teachers was deplored by those who believed that art professionals had important art-related contributions of their own to make to society in general, and to the war effort in particular. The following chapter considers a variety of organisations that attempted to identify and encourage war work appropriate to artists' talents and expertise, either by acting to save existing jobs or by agitating for the creation of new ones.

## Chapter 1: Endnotes

1. Mass-Observation, War Begins at Home (edited and arranged by Tom Harrisson and Charles Madge) (London: Chatto & Windus, 1940), pp.285-286.

2. George C. Nash, "An Artist's War-time Prayer," Punch (8 August 1941), p.321.

3. John Hinton, Rich Man, Poor Man (London: Allen Unwin, 1944), pp.23-26, 110-111, 133.

4. John Stevenson, "Myth and Reality: Britain in the 1930s," in Alan Sked and Chris Cook, eds., Crisis and Controversy: Essays in Honour of A.J.P. Taylor (London/Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1976), p.94.

5. John Stevenson, British Society 1914-45 (series: The Penguin Social History of Britain; J.H. Plumb, general ed.) (Great Britain: Allen Lane, 1984), pp.266-274.

6. 1931 Census of England and Wales, Occupation Tables (London: HMSO, 1934), table 1, p.12; 1931 Census of Scotland. Volume 3: Occupations and Industries (Edinburgh: HMSO, 1934), table 1, pp.34-35. The number of self-declared artists in England and Wales was consistently misquoted as approximately 10,000 by authors concerned with unemployment amongst artists. See, for example, Francis Watson, Art Lies Bleeding (London: Chatto & Windus, 1939), p.38; James Boswell, The Artist's Dilemma (series: New Developments, #1) (London: The Bodley Head, 1947), p.13; S. John Woods, "Letter to a Young Artist," Our Time, 4 #6 (January 1945), p.10.

7. Anonymous, "Summary of Memorandum Presented by C.I.A.D. to the Ministry of Labour: The Artist and Demobilisation," [CIAD] Bulletin, 1 #6 (February 1944), p.111.

8. Anonymous, "Art & Society: Art Patronage," [AIA] Bulletin, #84 (1944), [p.1]; Boswell, The Artist's Dilemma, op.cit., p.13. A comparable figure of 730 is given in S. John Woods, "Letter to a Young Artist," op.cit., p.10.

9. Douglas Goldring, "The Artist's Lot," Studio, 111 #518 (May 1936), p.288.

10. Board of Education, Royal College of Art: First Annual Report of the Council, 1937-1938 (London: HMSO, 1939), n.p.

11. Mass-Observation, War Begins at Home, op.cit., p.286.

12. A.J.P. Taylor, English History, 1914-1945 (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1965), p.567. Detailed discussion of the slow process of upgrading production to war levels is given in J.D. Scott and Richard Hughes, The Administration of War Production, and M.M. Poston, British War Production, pp.53-114 (both from the series History of the Second World War. United Kingdom Civil Series, Keith Hancock, ed.; War Production Series directed by M.M. Poston (London: HMSO and Longmans, Green and Co, 1955; 1952)).

13. The survey questions were printed in the AIA's Emergency Bulletin, #3 ([late September-early October 1939], [p.1], and the results were published in the [AIA] Bulletin, #58 (December 1939), [p.1]. The latter publication noted that 280 fine artists, 527 commercial artists and 619 industrial designers had replied to the questionnaire, and stated, "It is assumed that the replies received give a reasonable cross-section of conditions throughout the profession, coming as they do from artists and designers earning anything from less than £100 to several thousand pounds per year."

14. Anonymous, "Schedule of Reserved Occupations," [AIA] Emergency Bulletin, #3 ([late September-early October 1939]), [p.2]; anonymous, "Information from the Ministry of Labour and the Home Office," [AIA] Bulletin, #58 (December 1939), [p.2].

15. Mass-Observation, "Impact of the War on Art and Artists: First Four Months of the War" (typescript; 15 January 1940) (Tom Harrisson Mass-Observation Archive: Box Art 2, File B).

16. Vera Brittain, England's Hour (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd, 1941), p.109.

17. Anonymous, "Pencil Notes," Imperial Arts League Bulletin, #9 (August 1939), p.139.

18. One of Them, "The Liquidation of the Free-Lances," New Statesman and Nation, 19 #478 (20 April 1940), p.526.

19. Royal Society of British Sculptors, Annual Report of the Council with Accounts for the Year Ending the 31st December, 1939 ([no publication data]), p.10.

20. MoL, Summary of Unemployment Insurance Acts, 1920-1934 (London: HMSO, 1934).

21. Anonymous, "Emergency Assistance for Artists," [AIA] Emergency Bulletin, #3 ([late September-early October 1939]), [p.3].

22. MoI, "Press Notice No.12. Unemployment Assistance Board: Report of Wartime Distress" (8 September 1939) (copy in NG Archive: Ministry of Information Artists' Advisory Committee, 1939-).

23. MoL: CEAW, draft for "First Interim Report" ([November 1939]), [p.5] (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

24. Henry Moore, for example, was employed two days per week at the Chelsea School of Art, where the staff also included Graham Sutherland. Robert Austin, Edward Bawden, Barnett Freedman, Percy Horton, John and Paul Nash, R.V. Pitchforth, Eric Ravilious, Alan Sorrell and Gilbert Spencer were fixtures at the Royal College of Art; Rosemary Allan, Alan Gwynne-Jones and Walter Bayes were at the Slade. Leonard Rosoman and Matvyn Wright were on the staff of Reimann's School of Art in London, and Evelyn Gibbs taught at Goldsmith's College. Henry Carr was the Principal of the Beckenham School, Kenneth Holmes was the Principal of the Leicester College of Art, and D.M.Sutherland filled the same position at Grays School of Art. Other headmasters who were employed by the WAAC were Clifford Ellis (Bath School of Art), John Platt (Blackheath School), H.S. Williamson (Chelsea Polytechnic), William Washington (Hammersmith School), Percy Jowett (Royal College of Art), and Evan Charlton (Cardiff Art School, where Ceri Richards ran the painting classes from 1940 to 1944). Many young teachers, like Cedric Kennedy, Kathleen Allen and John Kingsley Cook, lost or resigned their jobs, although Leslie Cole (born in 1910) was still teaching at the Hull College of Arts and Crafts when he was given an MoI commission as an official war artist in 1942. William Dring (born in 1904) resigned his job at the Southampton College of Art only when he, too, became an official war artist in 1942.

25. Board of Education, Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London (London: HMSO, 1936), par.30, p.24.

26. Board of Education, Education in 1938, Being the Report of the Board of Education and the Statistics of Public Education for England and Wales (London: HMSO, 1939), p.176; Board of Education, Technical and Art Education and Other Forms of Further Education (England and Wales). List of the More Important Institutions Recognised by the Board of Education (London: HMSO, 1936), pp.60-66. There were also several private art institutions (such as the City and Guilds of London Institute and the Heatherley School of Fine Art), as well as an estimated (in 1939) 175 local art schools and 60 art classes of various types under the control of local education authorities (Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts: A Report Sponsored by the Dartington Hall Trustees (London/New York/Toronto: Geoffrey Cumberlege/Oxford University Press,

1946), p.84). The number of specialist art teachers in elementary schools was small, but even in these schools there may have been increased opportunities after c.1935, in which year the Council for Art and Industry recommended that "the employment of specialist teachers of Art should be encouraged in senior and central elementary schools as well as in secondary schools" (Board of Trade: Council for Art and Industry, Education for the Consumer. Art in Elementary and Secondary Schools Education (London: HMSO, 1935), p.36); see also Committee on Art and Industry, "Note of a Meeting Held on Thursday, 8th March 1934. Evidence of Mr. E.M. O'Rourke Dickey, Inspector of Art," in Council for Art and Industry, in PRO: BT 57/3 A.50.

27. c.1944: Board of Education, Teachers and Youth Leaders. Report of the Committee Appointed by the President of the Board of Education to Consider the Supply, Recruitment, and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders (London: HMSO, 1944), p.151. 1947: Board of Education, Education in 1947, Being the Report of the Board of Education and the Statistics of Public Education for England and Wales (London: HMSO, 1948), p.139.

28. Board of Education, Teachers and Youth Leaders, op.cit., p.151.

29. For general information on legislation affecting employment and conscription, see especially Godfrey Ince: The Ministry of Labour and National Service (series: Royal Institute of Public Administration, The New Whitehall Series, Robert Fraser, ed.), (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd/New York: Oxford University Press Inc, 1960) pp.41-42; and Mobilisation of Man-Power in Great Britain for the Second World War (Manchester: Norbury, Lockwood & Co. Ltd, 1945).

30. For example: Board of Education, Teachers and Youth Leaders, op.cit., p.84; and Board of Trade: Council for Art and Industry, Education for the Consumer. Art in Elementary and Secondary School Education (London: HMSO, 1935), p.20.

31. Watson, Art Lies Bleeding, op.cit., p.29.

32. Gilbert Spencer, in Maxwell Armfield, Adrian Bury et al, "Carried Unanimously [letter to the Editor]," Studio, 119 #562 (January 1940), p.24.

33. L.A.M. Evans, "It Must Go On!," National Society of Art Masters Journal, 12 #5 (March 1940), p.101. See also MoL: CEAW, "Memorandum by Mr. H.B. Wallis," p.1 (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

34. Mass-Observation, War Begins at Home, op.cit., pp.287-288.

35. Anonymous, "Adult Education and the Local Education Authorities in War Time," Adult Education, 12 #2 (November 1939), p.88. See also MoL: CEAW, "Memorandum by Mr. H.B. Wallis," op.cit., p.1.

36. Anonymous, "Notes and News: ... London Art Schools," [CIAD] Bulletin, 1 #2 (July 1941),. p.50.

37. Evans, "It Must Go On!," op.cit., p.101; Nan Youngerman, "Art Teaching in Secondary Schools," [AIA] Bulletin, #75 (January 1943), n.p.

38. Hansard, 352 (25 October 1939), column 1440.

39. E.M.O'R. Dickey, "War Activities in Art Schools 1939-42" (May 1943) (Board of Education (in PRO): ED 138/88).

40. Calculated from information given in Board of Trade: Council for Art and Industry, Design and the Designer in Industry (London: HMSO, 1937), p.35; and in Technical and Other Forms of Further Education, op.cit., pp.60-66,76.

41. Calculated from figures given in Board of Education, Education in 1938, op.cit., tables 67 and 68, pp.161-162. See also: MoL: CEAW, "Memorandum by Mr. H.B. Wallis," op.cit.

42. Board of Education, Education in 1938, op.cit., table 67, p.161. See also table 74, p.172.

43. [Mr.] Leonard (Buckinghamshire County Education Committee) to Secretary, Board of Education, 28 November 1941 (Board of Education (in PRO): ED 83/230).

44. Board of Education (in PRO): ED 83/233 - Poole Art School (Premises), 1940). Comparable information is given for other art schools in the many dozen other files in #D 83 (general heading: Further Education: Art School Files) and in ED 167.

45. Mass-Observation, War Begins at Home, op.cit., pp.217-218.

46. Anonymous, [miscellaneous information], Polytechnic [of Central London] Magazine (July 1946), p.5.

47. Council of RCA, Report (1937-1938; 1941-1942, 1943-1944, 1944-1945; all, typescripts), n.pp. (RCA Archive). Board of Education, Education in 1938, op.cit., p.33, gives the 1937-1938 attendance as 336). The reduction in numbers was slightly artificial because it reflected a policy decision to minimise enrolment so as not to overload the limited facilities available to the College during the War, but even so the

number of applications to sit the entry examination fell to 154 in 1941-1942 - a 42% decrease on the 1939-1940 total of 250 applications.

48. Clive Ashwin, A Century of Art Education, 1882-1982 ([London: Middlesex Polytechnic], 1982), pp.27,31.

49. MoL: CEAW, "Memorandum by Mr. H.B. Wallis," op.cit.

50. "Memorandum: The Employment of Artists During the War Period" (26 October 1939; memorandum presented to the CEAW), p.7 (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939); and the records of the AIA Murals Committee, in the Tate Gallery Archive, AIA 7043.2.5.

51. MoL: CEAW, draft for "First Interim Report," [pp.2,7]. See also the Minutes of the second meeting of the Committee, 25 October 1939 (both, NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

52. For example: Wilfred Salter, "A Vital Element of Reconstruction, Studio, 121 #577 (April 1941), pp.141-143.

53. MoL: CEAW, "Memorandum by Mr. H.B. Wallis," op.cit., p.3. According to this memorandum 496 men and 391 women taught art part-time for six or more hours per week, while 740 men and 530 women taught for fewer than six hours per week. Wallis admitted that the total number of part-time teachers thus represented (i.e., 2157) was probably an underestimate, the true total being closer to 2500.

54. Quoted in anonymous, "Notes: Art Teachers," [AIA] Bulletin, #58 ((December 1939), [p.3].

55. MoL: CEAW, "Memorandum by Mr. H.B. Wallis," op.cit., p.2. No employment statistics for part-time art teachers in Board schools have been located.

56. Individual archives rarely give such detailed information, and many no longer exist at all. Neither the archive of the History of Advertising Trust (London), the otherwise invaluable Advertisers' Annual yearbooks from the 1930's and 1940's, nor such standard reference texts as T.R. Nevett's, Advertising in Britain: A History (London: Heinemann, on behalf of the History of Advertising Trust, 1980), has much information of this type. According to Nicholas Kaldor and Rodney Silverman (A Statistical Analysis of Advertising Expenditure and of the Revenue of the Press (series: National Institute of Economic and Social Research, Economic and Social Studies) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948)), "The present investigation has shown two things very clearly in relation to the statistics of advertising expenditure. First,

there is a very serious lack of any systematic statistics on the subject, and in particular there is an almost complete absence of any official information" (p.182).

57. MoL: CEAW, "Chairman's Memorandum No.2" (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

58. Board of Trade, Council for Art and Industry, "Paper No.55: Committee on Advanced Art Education in London," p.2 (in PRO: BT 57/8 A.136).

59. Compiled from lists given in The Advertisers' Annual, 1937 (London: Legion Publishing Company Ltd., [1937]).

60. Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts, op.cit., pp.59,61.

61. F.P. Bishop, The Economics of Advertising (London: Robert Hale Limited, 1944), p.63. Bishop was noteworthy for his belief that most statistics regarding advertising costs were inflated.

62. Anonymous, "The Central Institute of Art and Design," Art & Industry, 32 (1942), p.101; T.A. Fennemore (Secretary, CIAD) to W.P. Gibson (Keeper, National Gallery), 20 February 1940 (NG Archive: Central Institute, 1940-1947). Charles Rosner claims that by 1943 the government was spending approximately £3,000,000 yearly on advertising ("Publicity Panorama 1942-48," in Frank A. Mercer and Charles Rosner, Modern Publicity 1942-48 (annual of Art & Industry) (London/New York: The Studio Publications, [1948/1949])).

63. Giles Playfair, speaking at the inaugural meeting of the Art and Entertainment Emergency Council, 1 December 1939, and quoted in Mass-Observation, "Impact of the War on Art and Artists," op.cit., p.5. See also anonymous, "Civil Defence Artists: London Exhibition," Manchester Guardian (9 October 1941).

64. Kaldor and Silverman, A Statistical Analysis of Advertising Expectations, op.cit., table 29, p.51.

65. Anonymous, "Trend of Annual Press Advertising Expenditure," Statistical Review of Press Advertising, 12 #2 (January 1944), p.22.

66. Rosner, "Publicity Panorama," op.cit., p.11.

67. Ibid., p.11.

68. Boswell, The Artist's Dilemma, op.cit., pp.35-36.



69. A.J.A. Symons, "The Art of the Book in Great Britain," Studio, 107 #494 (May 1934), p.235.

70. Calculated from tables published in yearly editions of Whitaker's Almanac: 1940, p.1115; 1941, p.501; 1942, p.512; 1943, p.521; 1944, p.521; and 1945, p.995.

71. For more detailed discussions see: Ian Norrie, Mumby's Publishing and Bookselling in the Twentieth Century 6th edition (London: Bell & Hyman, 1982), pp.58-70, 85-94; John Bland, A History of Book Illustration: The Illuminated Manuscript and the Printed Book (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1958), pp.361-386; Michael S. Howard, Jonathon Cape, Publisher (London: Jonathon Cape, 1971); and Joyce Irene Whalley and Teresa Rose Chester, A History of Children's Book Illustration (London: John Murray, with the Victoria and Albert Museum, 1988), chapters 10-11.

72. Particularly useful, though not exhaustive, lists of illustrated books published during the 1930's and throughout the War are given in: Albert Garrett, British Wood Engraving of the 20th Century: A Personal View (London: Scolar Press, 1980); and Edward Hodnett, Five Centuries of English Book Illustration (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1988).

73. A study of the reasons for the success of Picture Post is Stuart Hall's, "The Social Eye of Picture Post," in: University of Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Working Papers in Cultural Studies (Birmingham: University of Birmingham, 1972), pp.71-120.

74. Watson, Art Lies Bleeding, op.cit., p.35.

75. IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: Dennis Flanders, RWS, RBA (tape-recorded interview), reel #1.

76. IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: Terence Cuneo (tape-recorded interview), reels #1 and 2. Cuneo's Tanks and How to Draw Them was published in London and New York in 1943.

77. Frank Wootton to Duff Cooper (Minister of Information), 10 June 1940 (GP/46/31).

78. Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts, op.cit., p.66.

79. An examination of the activities undertaken to improve design in Britain beginning in the 1920's is given in Jonathon Woodham, "Design and Empire: British Design in the 1920s," Art History, 3 #2 (June 1980), pp.229-240. See also Gillian Naylor, "Design and Industry," in Boris Ford, ed., The

Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain. Volume 8: The Edwardian Age and the Inter-war Years (Cambridge/New York/New Rochelle/Melbourne/Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp.260-261.

80. General remarks on the growth of department and chain stores are given in Carol Hogben, "Design Introduction," in Arts Council of Great Britain, Thirties: British Art and Design Before the War (Great Britain: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1979), pp.76-77. The example of Marks and Spencer is taken from Stevenson, British Society 1914-45, op.cit., p.113.

81. The books included Room and Book (Paul Nash, 1932), Design in Modern Life (John Gloag, 1934), the much-read Art and Industry (Herbert Read, 1934), Industrial Art Explained (Gloag, 1934), Industrial Design and the Future (Geoffrey Holme, 1934), Design and a Changing Civilisation (Noel Carrington, 1935), A Survey of British Industrial Arts (H.G. Dowling, 1935), The Conquest of Ugliness (John de La Valette, 1935), Pioneers of the Modern Movement (Nikolaus Pevsner, 1936), An Enquiry into Industrial Art in England (Pevsner, 1937), Design in Daily Life (Anthony Bertram, 1937), and Design (Bertram, 1938). For periodical literature, see especially The Studio, Art & Industry, The Architectural Review, Decoration and Industrial Arts. Exhibitions were held by or at (inter alia) Dorland Hall (British Industrial Art in Relation to the Home, 1933 and 1934), Whiteley's (Exhibition of Modern Living, 1934), Burlington House (Art and Industry, 1935), Bowman's (1935), the Royal Institute of British Architects (Exhibition of Everyday Things, 1936), and Heal's (1936). Among the more active organisations and groups in the promotion of improved standards of design were the Board of Trade and its Council for Art and Industry, the British Institute of Industrial Art, the Industrial Art Committee of the Federation of British Industries, and the Design and Industries Association.

82. Geoffrey Holme, "The Artist's Contribution to the Nation's Industry," Studio, 102 #461 (August 1931), p.71.

83. Board of Education, Education in 1938, op.cit., table 69, p.163.

84. An unusually complete representation of the variety of views on this point is given in John de La Valette, "Collaboration Between Manufacturers and Artists" and the ensuing discussion, in the Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, 82 (23 March 1934), pp.511-534. For a typical criticism of the buyers, see John A. Milne, "The Artist in Industry," Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, 83 (25 January 1935), p.253. Pertinent criticism, and several recommendations for improvement, are given in Board of Trade (Committee on the Production and Exhibition of Articles of Good Design and Every-day Use),

Art and Industry. Report of the Committee Appointed by the Board of Trade Under the Chairmanship of Lord Gorell (London: HMSO, 1932). The Board of Trade's Council for Art and Industry considered the matter at length during the 1930's, and much relevant information presented to the Council during its investigation is filed in the Board of Trade papers at the PRO.

85. The contemporary literature on design training in schools is vast and contradictory. Useful summary comments are given in Nikolaus Pevsner, An Enquiry Into Industrial Art in England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937). See also four essays, all with the title "The Training of Art Students for Industry and Commerce," published in the Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, vol.83. In 1931 and 1932 The Studio (vols. 102-103) printed a series of informative articles that are somewhat atypical of contemporary literature as a whole, insofar as they praise the design training at selected art and technical schools. Much helpful material is also included in Council for Art and Industry (in PRO): BT 57/8 a.136 (especially "Paper No.55: Committee on Advanced Art Education in London" (March 1936)).

86. Pevsner, An Enquiry into Industrial Art, op.cit.; Board of Trade, Council for Art and Industry, Design and the Designer in Industry, op.cit.; Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts, op.cit.

87. For details about working conditions and salaries for designers, see especially: Design and the Designer in Industry, op.cit.; Design in the Jewellery, Silversmithing and Allied Trades (London: HMSO, 1937) and Design in the Pottery Industry (London: HMSO, 1937) (all: Board of Trade, Council for Art and Industry); and in Pevsner, An Enquiry into Industrial Art, op.cit.; Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts, op.cit.; Martin Battersby, The Decorative Thirties (London: Studio Vista, 1971), p.23; Geoffrey Holme, "What are Everyday Things," Studio, 111 #518 (May 1936), p.285; Herbert Read, essay appended to the Gorell Report, op.cit.; Watson, Art Lies Bleeding, op.cit., p.39; and Board of Education, Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London, op.cit., par.13, pp.12-13.

88. On the frequently strained relations between industry and artists, see: Sherban Cantacuzino, Wells Coates: A Monograph (London: Gordon Fraser, 1978), pp.24-29; Naylor, "Design and Industry," op.cit., pp.285-286; Paul Nash, "Goings On: The Artist and Industry," Weekend Review, 6 #133 (24 September 1932), p.343; and J.M. Richards, "Highpoint Flats at Highgate: The Building," Architectural Review, 79 (January 1936), pp.10-16.

89. National Register of Industrial Art Designers, Annual Report: Statement of Accounts and Balance Sheet for the Year 1938-39, Submitted to the Annual General Meeting on July 25th 1939 (England: The Euston Press, 1939), p.3.

90. Pevsner, An Enquiry into Industrial Art, op.cit., p.155. Statistics on the Federation of British Industries referral service are given in "Memorandum of Federation of British Industries Employment Bureau for Industrial Artists, by Mr. Tennyson" (April 1936), in two Council for Art and Industry files in the PRO: BT 57/14 A.228 and BT 57/26 A.502.

91. This point was stressed, early in the War, both in published texts and in briefs to government committees. For example: anonymous, "Artists and the War," Country Life, 86 (15 November 1939), p.538; T.C. Dugdale, W. Russell Flint and John A. Milne, "Creative Art in War-time: Planning for the Future [letter to the Editor]," Sunday Times (15 October 1939), p.10; typewritten notes from meetings of the Committee on the Employment of Artists in War-time; Ashley Havinden to R.E. Gomme, 13 December 1939; and MoL: CEAW, draft for "First Interim Report," [p.2] (all, NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

92. MoL: CEAW, draft for "First Interim Report," op.cit. [p.3].

93. MoL: CEAW, Chairman's Preliminary Memorandum" [1939], [pp.2-3] (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

94. MoL: CEAW, draft for "First Interim Report," op.cit., [p.2]; MoL: CEAW, "Second Interim Report" (21 December 1939), pp.1-2 (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

95. MoL: CEAW, draft for "First Interim Report," op.cit., [p.3].

96. MoL: CEAW, "Note on the Chairman's Interview with Sir Arnold Overton, Deputy Secretary, Board of Trade" ([October 1939]), n.p. (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

97. Geffrye Museum, CC41: Utility Furniture and Fashion (London: Inner London Education Authority, 1974).

98. Ibid., p.13; Jane Ashelford, "Utility Fashion," in ibid., pp.33-36.

99. David Joel, Furniture Design Set Free: The British Furniture Revolution from 1850 to the Present Day (London: J.M. Dent and Sons Limited, 1969), pp.45-48.

100. Geffrye Museum, CC41, op.cit., p.32.

101. "Memorandum: The Employment of Artists During the War Period," op.cit., p.6. Also useful is IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: Rupert Shephard (tape-recorded interview), reel #1.

102. The Society of Industrial Artists (founded in 1930) was the sole professional organisation representing the interests of industrial artists. At the outbreak of war its membership consisted of approximately 350 designers and commercial artists, 150 of whom were industrial designers. The Society's records were destroyed in an aerial attack during the War.

103. MoL: CEAW, draft for "First Interim Report," op.cit., [p.1]; "Chairman's Memorandum No.2," op.cit., [p.2].

104. Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts, op.cit., p.14. The Central Institute of Art and Design estimated that before the War at least 8000 designers and draughtsmen, along with several hundred freelances, were employed in industry (anonymous, "Summary of Memorandum Presented by C.I.A.D. to the Ministry of Labour," op.cit., p.112).

105. MoL: CEAW, "Chairman's Memorandum No.2," op.cit., [p.3].

106. Ibid., [p.2]. The Register sent a questionnaire to 639 designers at the beginning of the War, asking for details about employment status. Response was fragmentary, and no reliable conclusions could be drawn from the tabulation of answers; see MoL, CEAW, Minutes of the 1 November 1939 meeting (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

107. Gerald Reitlinger, The Economics of Taste. (Volume 1:) The Rise and Fall of Picture Prices, 1760-1960 (London: Barrie & Rockliff, 1961), pp.212-218. John Piper credited Michael Sadler's extensive purchases of art at this time with saving several artists, and even some galleries, from financial ruin ("Michael Ernest Sadler, Friend and Encourager," in Leicester Galleries, Selected Paintings, Drawings and Sculpture from the Collection of the Late Sir Michael Sadler, K.C.S.I., C.B., LL.D. (London: Leicester Galleries, 1944; exhibition held 7 January-10 February 1944)).

108. John Willett, Art in a City (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, for the Bluecoat Society of Arts, 1967), pp.19-20, 49, 109, 117.

109. Frank Lambert, "The Arts - Painting," Liverpool Echo (Centenary Edition; 1955), pp.77-78; referenced in ibid., pp.67-68.

110. William Coldstream, "How I Paint," Listener, 18 #453 (15 September 1937), pp.570-571; Arts Council of Great Britain, William Coldstream (Great Britain: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1962), p.6.

111. According to one of Nash's three notebooks in the Tate Gallery Archive, he earned £1191 from sales in 1929-1930 but only £563 in 1931-1932; see also Andrew Causey, "The Art of Paul Nash," in Tate Gallery, Paul Nash: Paintings and Watercolours (London: Tate Gallery, 1975), pp.26,35.

112. Charles Harrison, English Art and Modernism, 1900-1939 (London/Bloomington: Allen Lane/Indiana University Press, 1981), p.293; Watson, Art Lies Bleeding, op.cit., p.31.

113. Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts, op.cit., pp.49-50.

114. Pat Gilmour, Artists at Curwen: A Celebration of the Gift of Artists' Prints from the Curwen Studio (London: Tate Gallery, 1977), p.18.

115. David Mellor, "British Art in the 1930s: Some Economic, Political and Cultural Structures," in Frank Glover-smith, ed., Class, Culture and Social Change: A New View of the 1930s (Sussex: The Harvester Press Limited/New Jersey: Humanities Press Inc., 1980), p.186. On the decline of the print market, see Susan Lambert's essay "Prints and Book Illustration" in Arts Council of Great Britain, Thirties: British Art and Design Before the War, op.cit., pp.79-83.

116. Raymond Mortimer, "First Aid for the Artist," New Statesman and Nation, 18 #440 (29 July 1939), p.175.

117. Boswell, The Artist's Dilemma, op.cit., pp.14,16. Boswell conceded that part of the blame for the low sales figures at artists' societies' exhibitions was "partly due to the corner in buyers made by the dealers," but he believed this to be a relatively unimportant factor in the overall sales situation.

118. Neville A.D. Wallis, "Art in Wartime," Journal of the Royal Society of Arts (19 April 1940), p.542.

119. George H.B. Holland to WAAC, 18 December 1939 (GP/55/Ho-Hu - George H.B. Holland).

120. Frank Beresford to Alfred Yockney, 26 January 1940 (Tate: Yockney Papers, 724.54).

121. Laura Knight, quoted in Janet Dunbar, Laura Knight (London: Collins, 1975), p.162; Arthur Tooth to Stanley Spencer, 17 July 1940; quoted in John Rothenstein, ed., Stanley Spencer: The Man; Correspondence and Reminiscences (London: Paul Elek, 1979), p.89; see also Spencer's letters (and draughts for letters) in his papers in the Tate Gallery Archive, 733.1).

122. [Marita Ross], "War-time Art Galleries," unidentified newspaper, n.d. (Tate Archive: Marita Ross scrapbooks, vol. viii, p.68).

123. Anonymous, "Carrying On," Studio, 118 #560 (November 1939), p.217.

124. Solo or (more often) group exhibitions of contemporary British art had been held at Zwemmer's, Arthur Tooth & Sons, and the Leicester, Redfern, Warren and Mayor Galleries. They included the Leicester Galleries' Artists of Fame and Promise series; and Arthur Tooth & Sons' Recent Developments in British Painting (1931) and its subsequent Contemporary British Painting series.

125. Herbert Read, "Round the Exhibitions," Listener, 22 #567 (23 November 1939), p.1001.

126. Geoffrey Agnew, "Painters of Today: Contemporary English Exhibition [letter to the Editor]," Times (10 November 1939), p.6; H. Granville Fell, "The Connoisseur in War Time: The Arts and the Antique Dealers," Connoisseur, 104 #459 (November 1939), p.257; [Editor], "The Buyer's Market," Studio, 119 #562 (January 1940), p.1; Mass-Observation, "Impact of the War on Art and Artists," op.cit., p.5; Ernestine Carter, "Letter From London," Magazine of Art, 33 #1 (January 1940), p.64.

127. Julian Trevelyan, Indigo Days (London: Macgibbon & Kee, 1957), p.114; R.O. Dunlop, "Buying Pictures [letter to the Editor]," Times (27 July 1940), p.5.

128. Anonymous, "Painting and the Battle," Times (25 October 1940), p.5. However, Philip James (Art Director of CEMA) observed in 1944, "It is apparently impossible to make a living out of selling contemporary works only for their are no dealers in provincial cities where the interested citizen could get the vaguest idea of contemporary painting" (anonymous, "Art & Society: Art Patronage," op.cit., [p.1]).

129. Quoted in Jean Seaton, "Broadcasting and the Blitz," in James Curran and Seaton, Power Without Responsibility: The Press and Broadcasting in Britain (Great Britain: Routledge, 1981), p.146.

130. Jack Lindsay, British Achievement in Art and Music (series: Achievement Books, general ed. Noel Carrington) (London: The Pilot Press Ltd, [1945?]), p.36.

131. Geoffrey Agnew, Agnew's, 1817-1967 (London: The Bradbury Agnew Press Ltd., 1967), p.54; letter from David Posnett (The Leger Galleries Ltd.) to the author, 18 May 1987; Oliver Brown, Exhibition: The Memoirs of Oliver Brown (London: Evelyn, Adams & Mackay, 1968), p.109; letter from Jacqueline Cartwright (Alex Reid & Lefevre, Ltd.) to the author, 29 May 1987.

132. Central Statistical Office, Statistical Digest of the War (series: History of the Second World War, United Kingdom Civil Series; W.K. Hancock, ed.) (London: HMSO and Longmans Green and Co, 1956), p.200, table 181. This volume includes examples of improved income, for workers in specific jobs, between 1938 and 1945 (p.204, table 187).

133. Stevenson, British Society 1914-45, op.cit., p.118.

134. For example: Newton's "The Artist in the Witness Box: Eric Newton Sums Up," Listener, 23 #582 (7 March 1940), p.481; and anonymous, "Art and Society: Art Patronage," op. cit., [p.1].

135. Tom Harrisson, "War Books," Horizon, 4 #24 (December 1941), p.433.

136. Robert Herring, "Editorial," Life and Letters Today, 29 #44 (April 1941), p.4; Mass-Observation, "Impact of the War on Art and Artists," op.cit., p.13. For similar comments on the shift towards small rather than large sculpture, see anonymous, "Beautifully Less," Times (5 April 1940), p.9.

137. Herbert Furst, "A Defence of the Philistine," Apollo, 41 (1941), pp.22-24.

138. For example, Thomas McGreevy, "In the World's Art Centres: London," Studio, 119 #562 (January 1940), p.25.

139. Henry Moore, interviewed by Pat Gilmour, 10 February 1977; p.5 of transcript (Tate: Henry Moore 8022.5).

140. Graham Bell, "Art in the 'Island Fortress': A Review of Contemporary British Painting," Studio, 120 #571 (October 1941), pp.108-109.

141. Maria Tippet, The History of the Canadian War Memorial Scheme as a Study of Patronage and Visual Record of the Great War (Ph.D. thesis, University College, London, 1982), pp.12-28, 138. Hesketh Hubbard noted, in September 1939,



that sales from at least one exhibiting society had been almost seven times greater at the society's final First World War exhibition than they had been during peacetime ("The Arts in War-time [letter to the Editor]," Times (20 September 1939), p.4).

142. A.C.R. Carter, comp. The Year's Art, 1942-1944: A Concise Epitome of All Matters Relating to the Arts of Painting, Sculpture, Engraving and Architecture, and to Schools of Design Which Have Occurred During the Years 1941, 1942, 1943, Together with Information Respecting the Events of the Year 1944, with Full-page Illustrations (London: Hutchinson and Co (Publishers) Ltd, [1944]).

143. George Edinger, "Everybody Wants to Buy a Picture: There Are Not Enough Artists to Paint Them," Daily Mail (24 April 1943), p.2.

144. Harold Sawkins, "Art Thrives Exceedingly in War-time," Artist, 28 #1 (September 1944), p.145; Cora Gordon, "London Commentary," Studio 129 #623 (February 1945), p.56.

145. 1938: Watson, Art Lies Bleeding, op.cit., p.181. 1939: anonymous, "Art," Cavalcade (21 August 1943), p.15; Peyton Boswell ("Art Booms in Britain," Art Digest, 18 #1 (1 October 1943), p.3) gives a total of 187 works, sold for \$38,720. 1940: P. Boswell, p.3; given as 134 pictures sold for a total of £5160 in Mr. Gossip, "Talk of the Town: ... Unwanted Pictures," Daily Sketch (7 August 1941), p.6; and as 137 works sold for £5262 in anonymous, "Art," Cavalcade, p.15. 1941: P. Boswell, p.3. 1942: anonymous, "Art," Cavalcade, p.15; P. Boswell, p.3) gives 237 works sold for \$32,555; Hesketh Hubbard, 100 Years of British Painting (London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1951), pp.284-285. 1943: anonymous, "Buying A Picture," Times (12 August 1943), p.5. P. Boswell (p.3) gives 405 works for a total of \$56,105; anonymous, "Art," Cavalcade (p.15.) gives 420 and £11,890, respectively; see also anonymous, "Buying a Picture," p.5. 1945: Hubbard, op.cit., p.285.

146. All statistics regarding attendance at Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours exhibitions are taken from the Society's notebook Exhibitions, Vol.5 (1929-195-) (Bankside Gallery). Exhibitions did not all remain open the same length of time, but the differences are insufficient to account for the substantial variations in numbers of visitors. Statistics on numbers of works sold, and total costs (to end of 1944) are in the Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours' Journal: Sales, 1914-1944. The same information for 1945 and later is in the Society's record book [1915-1919; 1945-1957] (both, Bankside Gallery).

147. Royal Society of Painter-Etchers and Engravers, various notebooks: 1934-1967; Reports of the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, 1903-1943; and Minute Book [1918-1954] (all, Bankside Gallery).

148. John Rothenstein, The Tate Gallery (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1963), p.42; see also Eric Newton, Art for Everybody (London/New York/ Toronto: Longmans Green and Co, for the British Council, 1943) (series: Britain Advances, #7), pp.12-13).

## Chapter 2

### Wartime Employment and Patronage Schemes

"There is no such thing as culture in wartime."

-Daily Express, 13 April 1940

"[...] This] is an all-in modern war fought mainly by technical experts (airmen etc.) and people who are patriotic according to their lights but entirely reactionary in outlook. At present there is no function in it for intellectuals."

-George Orwell, 1941<sup>1</sup>

### Artists and Art Organisations in Wartime

The outbreak of the First World War had taken much of the British population by surprise. Although politicians and statesmen had believed during the years immediately preceding 1914 that a general war was inevitable, their belief had been based upon information that was not common knowledge. From the vantage point of those outside diplomatic circles, potentially explosive situations seemed to have been defused and international relations to have been placed on a firmer footing than they had enjoyed in some time.<sup>2</sup>

In contrast, the Second World War had been widely expected since at least the Czechoslovakia crisis in September 1938. Many, convinced that the growth of Fascism could be checked only by force, had begun predicting it months or even years earlier. The Munich agreement of September 1938 seemed to

offer breathing space, but not a solution. Appeasement had its limits, and the belief that war against Hitler was inevitable became ever more general as the autumn of 1939 approached. Alex Comfort spoke for his contemporaries in saying that his generation had grown up "in the certainty that we would be killed in action on behalf of an unreality against an insanity."<sup>3</sup>

The expectation of war served as an impetus, well before the official declaration of hostilities, to the taking of precautions to ensure social continuity. This preparedness extended to plans to protect museum collections and to keep artists productive. As early as 1933 the First Commissioner of the Works had met with museum and gallery directors to begin planning evacuation measures.<sup>4</sup> By the spring of 1939 the Ministry of Labour had begun looking seriously into the contributions that artists might make to a national war effort. Newspapers were congratulated for voicing early concern on the subject of the likely state of artists' welfare under war conditions, and their interest was favourably compared to the lack of similar coverage during the First World War.<sup>5</sup> As a result art critic Jan Gordon, writing in The Observer on the last day of 1939, felt justified in claiming, "The prospects for artists and art workers are far better for 1940 than ever they were for 1915."<sup>6</sup>

Many others, however, felt that the consideration that had been given to the continuation of the visual arts during

the War - though admirable - was insufficient, and that artists were likely to suffer severe economic dislocation. David Bomberg, for example, complained to The Times that art was being relegated to oblivion, and that this was "creating stress among the individual artists, who are now almost entirely deprived of private patronage and thereby left stranded without any means of support."<sup>7</sup> Like many others, he urged the implementation of more programmes to put artists to work; but (again like many others) he did not advocate such measures solely for the sake of the artists themselves, but also for the sake of the nation. He argued that the neglect of art was "depriving the nation of part of its richest heritage." Similarly, the periodical Britain To-day voiced a point of view also promoted by other journals when it claimed (in February 1941), "A civilized nation, compelled to defend itself in war, must strive to the utmost to prevent the submergence of the most civilized elements within its life."<sup>8</sup> Sacheverell Sitwell struck the same note in his catalogue text for an exhibition at the Cooling Galleries, London: "Painters, no less than their pictures, have become a symbol."<sup>9</sup> Letters published in The Spectator in September and October 1939 criticised the exclusion of the artist ("the only truly unique being [... and therefore] the only truly irreplaceable being") from the Schedule of Reserved Occupations. "You have," wrote Samuel Heald, "... the anomalous position of a war waged to safeguard freedom of thought in which nothing whatever is being done to pre-

serve the few that are capable of this very unusual activity."<sup>10</sup> This view was also accepted by many who had hitherto shown little interest in the arts, and whose support for protecting them and their practitioners in wartime was characterised by James Boswell as having a "'woodman spare that tree' flavour."<sup>11</sup>

Several commentators remarked upon the need to compile a visual, interpretive history of the War for the information and instruction of later generations. Others stressed the necessity of maintaining a commitment to the arts because of the latter's therapeutic value in difficult times, and because of the anticipation that, in the postwar years, the arts would be needed to smooth the country's economic transition into a new world. According to an editorial in The Listener (January 1940),

It is certain that, when peace comes, we shall need every force that can be enlisted for the expression of truth and the inspiration of action. Already ... in the years before the war we felt the need of a livelier and more effective public sense of architectural values to protect us against the destruction of fine buildings in town and country. Already we needed in many of our industries a better sense of design, that one effective passport through tariff barriers.<sup>12</sup>

In addition, the 1930's revulsion against the human costs of both rampant industrialisation and Fascism, and the belief that artists should become involved in important socio-political issues, was still potent. The same considerations that had

encouraged the Artists' International Association, the activities of Mass-Observation, the rise of the philosophically inter-related phenomena of humanitarian realism, popularism and documentary art, the development of the British Institute of Adult Education's Art for the People series of educative travelling exhibitions, and the involvement of several artists in the Spanish Civil War, now led not only to art magazines urging artists to actively support their country during the War,<sup>13</sup> but also to the BBC's Artist in the Witness Box series of talks in 1939-1940,<sup>14</sup> and ultimately an angry letter written to Horizon in 1940 by Goronwy Rees. Rees agreed that many artists could make their best contribution to the war effort by continuing with their work, but objected to Horizon's claim that "War is the enemy of creative activity and writers and painters are right and wise to ignore it." According to Rees,

They (the artists) must also realize that their liberty and security are altogether threatened, that Fascism is against them. That is, the war ... is being fought in part for them; in some ways most of all for them.<sup>15</sup>

For many artists, then, the War seemed to present an opportunity to use their art both to cement their links with the rest of society and to make a personal contribution to the defeat of Fascism. As an approving critic noted in 1941, "Not for many generations can artists have been in closer touch with the general public, nor have been inspired by events with which every citizen is deeply concerned, to do such fine

work."<sup>16</sup> Combined with arguments in support of art as a symbol of civilised values, of the anticipated economic and therapeutic value of art during and immediately after the War, and of the wisdom of not expecting artists to abandon their professional interests until peace returned, this lent a respectable degree of published support to artists' demands for the creation of projects that would offer them employment qua artists after September 1939. Nothing demonstrated the need for such groups and projects better than the plight in which architects found themselves when the Royal Institute of British Architects failed to speak effectively on their behalf against the ban on private building, the lack of coordination of an official building policy, and the government's failure to bolster confidence by giving adequate guarantees to property owners that compensation for damage would be available at the end of the War. (By early December 1939 more than 10,000 architects were unemployed. The situation was characterised as "the collapse of a profession.")<sup>17</sup>

Like the RIBA, artists' societies and organisations came under threat, but unlike the RIBA many struggled as hard to defend their members as they did to remain solvent. For example, Ala Story formed the British Art Centre at the Stafford Gallery in 1939, with the intention of creating a fund that would be put at the disposal of the Contemporary Art Society to buy works by living British artists.<sup>18</sup> However, good intentions and resourcefulness were not usually sufficient. Some



organisations slid into financial difficulties as their memberships declined.<sup>19</sup> The Contemporary Art Society, for example, enrolled eleven new members in 1940-1941, but lost fifty-seven. It allocated £1250 for purchases in 1940, but only £800 in 1941, and £500 in 1942.<sup>20</sup> The Artists' International Association recorded in December 1939 that "several hundred" subscriptions were overdue. The Association calculated that, counting the £221 in outstanding subscriptions as credits (a policy which proved overly optimistic), it had a balance of only £79.14s.11d.<sup>21</sup> The Imperial Arts League lost 17% of its paying members between November 1939 and March 1942, and nine of the twelve exhibiting societies that had given it financial aid in 1939 failed to do so in 1940.<sup>22</sup> The Royal Society of Painter-Etchers and Engravers, noting that the War made it difficult for members to pay subscription fees, and having discovered that its Charter forbade the fees to be waived, decided to accept token interim payments of £1.1s or £2.2s. Even so, in 1943 the Society found itself compelled to violate its own Charter by refraining until the end of hostilities from striking names off the membership list for non-payment of dues.<sup>23</sup> Ten days after the War had begun, the Council of the Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours adopted a different tactic. Its Council authorised the sale of up to £1000 of the Society's securities to meet the emergency, but only two months later the RSPWC was suffering considerable financial problems resulting from cancellations of bookings of

its gallery space, reduced attendances at its own exhibitions, and other problems.<sup>24</sup>

Yet, despite difficulties, the RSPWC continued in operation through to 1945. Several groups, including the Royal Drawing Society, the Society of Graphic Art, the Society of Miniaturists, and the Society of Women Artists, suspended activities at the beginning of the War or within its first two years; but an impressive number of other associations and societies - such as the British Water-colour Society, the London Group, the New English Art Club, the Royal Birmingham Society of Artists, the Royal Cambrian Academy, the Royal Society of Portrait Painters, the Saint Ives Society of Artists, the Society of Wood-engravers, and the Women's International Art Club - refused to slip into inactivity.<sup>25</sup>

Small, localised projects also gave sporadic assistance to artists. Municipal and county governments, for example, were frequently willing to sponsor employment projects for local artists, and this was especially true if such projects could be deemed to meet such topical requirements as "the adaptation of street nameplates, signs, etc. to wartime conditions."<sup>26</sup> The Sheffield City Corporation named native son Richard Seddon "Official War Artist to the City of Sheffield," and by May 1941 had commissioned him to paint eighteen pictures at ten guineas apiece.<sup>27</sup> In 1943 Birmingham City Council voted to reserve a percentage of the construction costs of new schools for the schools' artistic decoration.<sup>28</sup> The Church of

England was subjected to a flurry of proposals for art commissions because (as The Studio noted in 1940), art, like religion, "requires inspiration, reverence and true humility. It is essentially of the spirit."<sup>29</sup> The Sussex Committee of Artists and Churchmen, inaugurated as a pilot project at the end of 1939, encouraged churches to commission memorials, rolls of honour, and paintings of religious subjects.<sup>30</sup> Another general Church committee proposed the revival of gravestone carving for sculptors.<sup>31</sup> Employers like London Transport and the John Summers aircraft factory commissioned artists to record their contributions to the war effort,<sup>32</sup> and Lawrence Haward (Director of the Manchester City Art Gallery) convinced seven local engineering companies to commission artists to chronicle wartime work on their premises and to donate the resulting pictures to the Gallery.<sup>33</sup>

In general, however, these miscellaneous employment projects could not hope to compensate for the hardships imposed upon artists by the War. It was thus evident that a need existed for artists' organisations to concern themselves with large-scale stimulation of wartime employment opportunities. This need was especially pressing during the first year of the War, during most of which unemployment soared.

#### Employment: Art(s) Organisations

Many artists' organisations that had been established

before 1939 made attempts not only to ensure their own continuity, but to facilitate the creation of employment projects for artists in general. Several more organisations were founded after August 1939. Most of them were not markedly successful, for any of a variety of reasons; the latter included war-induced financial difficulties, credibility problems, unclear ideas about what sorts of action were required, and reluctance to pursue their ideas in the face of government disinterest. The following pages present a survey of representative examples of these organisations, and note the various reasons for their success or (more typically) their failure.

The Imperial Arts League, although its history as an active advocate of artists' welfare had earned it the support of every art society in the country with any pretensions to importance,<sup>34</sup> was one of the organisations that - like the Royal Institute of British Architects - was unexpectedly quiescent. The IAL wrote to the government towards the end of 1938, and again in 1939, offering assistance to the Central Register Branch of the Ministry of Labour in the compilation of lists of artists who could be usefully employed in the event of war. The MoL, however, showed little interest in these offers.<sup>35</sup> The IAL's decision to stop badgering the government was interpreted by the first Secretary of the War Artists' Advisory Committee as a waste of a strong bargaining position.<sup>36</sup>

Problems of other types plagued the Royal Academy. In

November 1939 a letter was sent from the Academy to the Prime Minister, "drawing attention to the difficulties of artists at the present time and supporting the allocation of a small percentage of the cost of buildings specially erected for war purposes to their decoration by artists." Shortly thereafter the Academy convened a meeting to discuss a proposal which had been forwarded to it, for the creation of a body to be named the Federation of British Artists. The intended purpose of the Federation was the promotion of "the employment of artists and designers by the Government, municipal, financial & commercial bodies, the theatre & churches throughout the Empire."<sup>37</sup>

The Academy seemed, on the basis of tradition and social prestige, the logical choice to lead such a federation. It was the most widely-known art organisation in Britain, and its annual members' exhibitions were the occasions on which a number of provincial art galleries made most or all of their acquisitions in the area of contemporary art. However, its credibility as an organisation speaking for British artists as a whole was limited by its often conservative tastes - a factor that had been emphasised by the recent and stormy resignations of three of its leading members (Walter Sickert and Stanley Spencer in 1935, and Augustus John in 1938), and by criticisms that it squandered much of the Chantrey Bequest on minor works by its own members.<sup>38</sup> (Punch gave timely advice to budding art critics in 1945: "Towards works on exhibition for the first time, be broad-minded and of course ambiguous,

unless they are shown at the Royal Academy, in which case kill them."<sup>39</sup>) The Academy's related failure to obtain the good will of Kenneth Clark (who believed that the august organisation considered him a "dangerous revolutionary"<sup>40</sup>) was a particularly severe blow. As Chairman of the War Artists' Advisory Committee, Clark was a key figure at a time when the government was preparing to become the richest and most active patron of contemporary art in the country.

Any claims that the Academy was disposed to make regarding its appropriateness as the leader of the proposed Federation of British Artists were thus weak. In the event, the project was almost immediately abandoned by the Academy. The latter instead went on (in December 1940) to enlist the support of the King in an ill-informed attempt to gain for its own members a mandate to compile a pictorial history of the War, despite the fact that this task was already being performed by the WAAC.<sup>41</sup> During the remainder of the War, the RA made its galleries available to smaller art organisations, but did little to spearhead - or even to support - projects designed to put artists to work. Indeed, when the proposed Federation of British Artists was established (in the form of the Central Institute of Art and Design; see below), the Academy made itself conspicuous by refusing to affiliate itself with the CIAD.

The interests of several other pre-war artists' organisations were also too narrow to enable them to exercise much

influence over the welfare of artists in general after September 1939. The Royal Society of British Sculptors, for example, produced a steady stream of employment ideas based upon Gilbert Ledward's assertion that sculpture was "the only method available for leaving a permanent record of contemporary events for posterity."<sup>42</sup> Kenneth Clark and the WAAC, however, argued that sculpture was useful primarily for commemorative purposes, and the Armed Services showed little conviction that sculpture (despite the optimistic expectations of the RSBS) had important military applicability.<sup>43</sup>

Aside from organisations such as the IAL, the RA and the RSBS, some groups were founded only after August 1939, in direct response to the War. Some of them intended to benefit art and artists without necessarily placing the latter in jobs that were immediately useful in defeating Germany. The Art and Entertainment Emergency Council, for example, enunciated (at its inaugural meeting, in December 1939) its intention "to foster and preserve British Cultural Services," "to watch over and promote the interests of cultural workers," and "to provide entertainment and cultural education."<sup>44</sup> At a time when the Treasury was pouring unprecedented amounts of money into the war effort, and when the Ministry of Labour was concerned with maximising individual manpower contributions, such goals were unlikely to recommend themselves highly to government authorities. By creating a more widespread interest in the arts than had existed before September 1939 the Council hoped

to encourage a broader demand for them, and thus to stimulate official support. However, as the National Society of Art Masters noted in January 1940, "Getting money out of the Government to finance a spearhead to drive the Government to sympathetic action is a tall expectation."<sup>45</sup> This difficulty was exacerbated by the fact that several of the Council's activities (such as arranging art exhibitions in rural areas) duplicated others already being carried out by organisations such as the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, and the British Institute of Adult Education. Other of its plans, such as supplying art teachers to schools that had not previously employed any, imposed unrealistic demands upon the strained wartime budgets of local education authorities. These problems were further compounded by the fact that, although it had an impressive list of supporters,<sup>1</sup> the Council had almost no money. In May 1940 it was still a volunteer organisation, seeking £250 and a staff of organisers to put itself onto a firmer footing. Shortly thereafter it slipped into low-profile quietude.<sup>46</sup>

Like the Art and Entertainment Emergency Council, Viscount Esher (who had a strong interest in the arts, and who had served as a trustee of the London Museum, and as the Chairman of the British Drama League, the Society for the

---

<sup>1</sup> Among them were film director Anthony Asquith, conductor, composer and opera impresario Thomas Beecham, A.P. Herbert (author and, since 1935, an Independent Member of Parliament), George Bernard Shaw, and Kenneth Clark.



Protection of Ancient Buildings and the London Theatre Council), represented a project that was not seriously concerned with the use of art to promote the war effort. However, unlike the Council, Esher took as his concern the prevention of promising artists, writers, composers and musicians from being killed in action.<sup>47</sup> He hoped to accomplish this by identifying the most promising arts practitioners under the age of forty (that being the upper age limit for conscription when Esher initiated his project in September 1939), and by making quiet arrangements to assign them to comparatively safe jobs within the Armed Forces.

At a meeting held on 25 October 1939 Esher established three committees to deal with writers, with artists, and with composers and musicians, respectively.<sup>2</sup> On 20 February 1940 the recommendations of all three committees were forwarded to the Secretary of State for War, who rejected them on the grounds that they violated National Service regulations. Without cooperation from this quarter Esher could not hope to succeed with his project. Early in 1940 he abandoned it.<sup>48</sup>

Esher's plan not only risked creating legal and public relations storms, but also raised the question of objectivity and subjectivity in the selection of artists. The perception

---

<sup>2</sup> The members of the Art Committee were Kenneth Clark, Percy Jowett, Randolph Schwabe, Paul Nash, Clive Bell, Jack Beddington, Edward Marsh, and George Charles Montagu the latter a member of the Contemporary Art Society and of the Art Section of the British Council, and a Trustee of the Tate Gallery.

of the art world as a place dominated by cliques was a strong one, and if selected artists were to be exempted from dangerous military service the government naturally wished to ensure that it had the opinion of an acknowledged authority to justify such actions. Kenneth Clark - the Director of the National Gallery, friendly with the Prime Minister and the Royal Family, and well-known in the press - was just such an authority. That the Ministry of Information gave Clark (through the WAAC) the power to implement a project similar in several respects to the one proposed by Esher, indicated that the government was not implacably opposed to keeping artists out of the line of fire, but only that it was unwilling to entrust the supervision of such a project to anyone lacking Clark's reputation, experience and contacts.<sup>3</sup>

Unlike both Viscount Esher's project and the Art and Entertainment Emergency Council, some artists' organisations were interested principally in expediting the war effort itself by actively promoting the advantageous use that could be made of artists' abilities. Paul Nash, for example, founded the Arts Bureau in Oxford for this purpose, as he explained in an article published in November 1939:

---

<sup>3</sup> Concern over the presumed variations of opinion regarding the worth of specific artists were borne out in the discrepancies between the twenty-two artists on Esher's list and the 138 given contracts - thirty-seven as official war artists - by the WAAC. Only eight of Esher's artists were given official war artist status by the WAAC, five were given short-term contracts, and twenty-two had no dealings with the Committee; see Appendix 1, part 7.

...Most people I met, among writers and artists at least, could be divided into two states: those who had been absorbed by war work to which they were more or less unsuited, and those who had nothing to do and no sort of prospect of a job of any kind. In the course of a few days I happened to encounter a number of men of unusual ability, artists of originality, writers of imagination and expert knowledge; apart from the distress of unemployment and the void that seemed to face them, they impressed me chiefly as a monstrous waste of material which might be turned to practical account in the war.<sup>49</sup>

Nash contended that, in addition to the avenues in which the government hoped to employ artists, "there remain at least ten other categories, and fifty different ways in which artists could give expert service." He focused upon six principal categories of employment: camouflage, records, propaganda, medical service, munitions supply, and intelligence.<sup>50</sup> By November 1939 he had compiled a list of proposed job categories, sets of dossiers of appropriate artists, and analyses of the needs of several ministries and departments. Relevant dossiers were then forwarded to the Ministries of Labour, of Information and of Economic Warfare, the Home Office, the Department of Overseas Trade, the British Council, Chatham House, the Central Institute of Art and Design, and miscellaneous committees and individuals (including Viscount Esher and Kenneth Clark).<sup>51</sup>

The profiles of the men on Nash's Panel of Authorities

and on his Executive Committee were impressive,<sup>4</sup> and Nash himself worked hard to demonstrate the viability of the Arts Bureau. When Thomas Fennemore (Secretary of the Central Institute of Art and Design) visited in November 1939 he gave the impression that he thought the Bureau was of "a unique character, and what is more, [it is] regarded as the most thorough piece of work of its kind that has yet been done."<sup>52</sup> However, due to shortages of labour, only artists invited by Nash to register with the Arts Bureau were accepted.<sup>53</sup> Money was also a difficulty, as Nash quickly discovered in his efforts to solicit donations.<sup>54</sup> In addition, the Arts Bureau concentrated on coordinating what was essentially a selective referral service at a time when the Ministry of Labour had already compiled extensive lists of artists suitable for specific types of work. These difficulties were compounded by Nash's poor health, and within four months of establishing the Arts Bureau ("a wild affair which was near being the end of us since it turned out a monster that devoured time, energy and all our spare money"<sup>55</sup>), he asked Fennemore to absorb the artists' section within the Central Institute of Art and Design.<sup>56</sup>

Markedly more successful than the Arts Bureau were

---

<sup>4</sup> The Panel of Authorities included Kenneth Clark, Muirhead Bone, Percy Jowett (Principal of the Royal College of Art since 1935, and Chairman of the Imperial Arts League) and Randolph Schwabe. Among the nine members of the Executive Committee were Lord Berners (14th Baron Gerald Hugh Tyrwhitt, a composer, painter and writer), author John Betjeman, and artists John Piper, Albert Rutherston and Paul Nash himself.

schemes that identified single tasks that artists could perform in wartime, and that then took decisive action to implement their recommendations. For example, ideas for commissioning pictures of buildings damaged in air raids were promoted, especially during 1940. According to a letter published in The Connoisseur, such drawings and paintings would function both as "permanent record[s] for posterity" and as propaganda directed towards members of the neutral American public, "whose sympathy with Britain's cause is growing daily [in 1940], [and who] would have the opportunity of seeing exactly what the enemy has done to our symbols of mutual culture...."<sup>57</sup> Other plans were more concerned with capturing the appearance of the country before air raids changed it irrevocably.<sup>58</sup> (This concern was an aspect of the increasing interest in British history, literature and art.) Beginning in early 1941 photographers were given opportunities to work for the National Buildings Record, accumulating detailed photographs of structures that were deemed to have national historic and/or architectural value, and by June 1944 some 225,000 photographs had been acquired in this way.<sup>59</sup>

Similarly, the Brewers' Association gave employment to thirty-five artists in its £10,000 "Londoner's England" scheme, undertaken in 1944 to record the appearance of distinctive pubs.<sup>60</sup> The Association resolved to launch this scheme after the demise in 1943 of the much more ambitious "Recording Britain" project, which was funded from 1939 until

1943 by the Pilgrim Trust.<sup>61</sup> Artists for Recording Britain were selected on the basis of their abilities and their financial need. They were engaged for initial periods of four weeks (at £24 per week), and none were expected to receive more than sixteen weeks of work.<sup>62</sup> Sixty-three artists eventually received commissions, and twenty-eight others sold works to the project. Many of them, including John Piper and Kenneth Rowntree, also had work purchased or commissioned by the WAAC. A total of 1549 pictures were acquired altogether, representing thirty-two English and four Welsh counties. A similar undertaking, also sponsored by the Pilgrim Trust, was developed in Scotland.<sup>63</sup>

The War Artists and Illustrators group was as successful as the Recording Britain project. It owed its success to its aggressive filling of a single niche: the need for what the WAAC described as the "'Boys Annual' type of war illustration"<sup>64</sup> that was demanded by the Ministry of Information as well as by such publications as The Illustrated London News. Created within two months of the outbreak of hostilities, with the intention of "forming a Pictorial Diary of the War and ... selling and syndicating these drawings throughout the World as post-cards and newspaper reproductions,"<sup>65</sup> it quickly became much sought-after. By mid-January 1940 the Foreign Publicity Division of the MoI had ordered 15,000 sets (six cards apiece) of postcards produced by the group, and the Empire Publicity Division was expected to take similar action.<sup>66</sup> Drawings were

also syndicated weekly to allies and potential allies abroad by the Studio and Photographic Divisions of the MoI. Although its original market was in propaganda, ministerial projects and work for newspapers, the War Artists and Illustrators were also, by 1941, involved in producing illustrations for advertising.<sup>67</sup> Even the WAAC, though it had little interest in the group's emphasis on dramatic illustrations, nonetheless recognised the value of the Illustrators' work and was willing to recommend that facilities on the Continent be made available to its members.<sup>68</sup>

Other organisations set more general agendas than did Recording Britain and the War Artists and Illustrators, but enjoyed comparable degrees of success. The Artists' International Association, for example, made good use of lobbying skills acquired in the course of its history of strenuous opposition to Fascism. The AIA came out firmly and formally in favour of seeking wartime employment opportunities for artists in 1940, when members' criticism of its statements (August and September 1939) in support of the Soviet Union and of military action against Fascism led to the adoption of a policy not to espouse a specific political position regarding the War, but rather to pursue two less contentious goals:

The first is to assure that the talent of those artists who wish to help win such a war is not wasted, in tasks which other people can do equally well, while there remains specialist work to be done, for which artists are particularly well equipped. The second is to see that the

culture of the country is not annihilated during the period of hostilities.<sup>69</sup>

Among artists' organisations that had existed prior to 1939, the AIA became the most persistent and vocal proponent of the employment of artists, a cause which it related to its concern with making art more accessible to the general population.<sup>70</sup> During the first weeks of the War the AIA established close connections with the Society of Industrial Artists, the Imperial Arts League and the National Register of Industrial Art Designers. Along with the Art Workers' Guild, the National Society of Art Masters and the Society of Mural Painters, and with input from members of the Faculty of Royal Designers for Industry, these groups formed the Artists' Unemployment Advisory Committee,<sup>71</sup> concerned with making plans for such activities as "persuading the various industries utilising designers to set up research organisations which will continue to develop design in these industries, even should trade be so organised as to make impossible the utilisation of new designs during the war period."<sup>72</sup> In its memorandum of recommendations, the Committee proposed "a plan similar in many respects to the Federal Art Project in America," and identified a variety of timely sources of income for artists. These included exhibitions, art instruction, making visual records of the War, decorating such buildings as barracks, hospitals, canteens and ARP shelters, and working in commercial art and industrial design.<sup>73</sup>



Even after c.1942, by which time most other non-governmental organisations lobbying for the employment and welfare of artists had abandoned or severely restricted their efforts, the AIA continued to feature (in its Bulletin) suggestions for timely employment in the Armed Forces and in propaganda (an area in which, as its 1943 For Liberty exhibition demonstrated, it considered government efforts to be unimaginative).<sup>74</sup> The Association also stimulated the growing public interest in seeing and purchasing contemporary art. It promoted such art outside of London (through the establishment of regional centres and the circulation of exhibitions of members' work),<sup>75</sup> and encouraged printmaking and mural painting. The latter concern culminated in Richard Carline's ultimately successful efforts to establish the National Mural Council (1943) to prompt the commissioning of murals by industry.<sup>76</sup>

Yet despite its efforts, the AIA remained anxious throughout the War that it was not succeeding in finding as many jobs for artists as it would have liked. Difficulties beyond its control forced the cancellation of the proposed second series of Everyman Prints, and with it hopes that the sale of inexpensive prints could become a significant source of income for contemporary artists. Similarly, although the AIA sent some five hundred reasonably-priced works of art on tour during the War, and although reaction to these exhibitions was usually good, the sales could not be construed as an important source of income.<sup>77</sup> The Association's acknowledgment

that it was not succeeding as hoped in creating jobs was strongly voiced as early as its 1941 general meeting.<sup>78</sup> However, even if the AIA concluded that it had been unable to meet its own wartime expectations, its sustained efforts to expand the audience for art were to have important consequences in the post-war years.

In its 1945 brochure Full Employment for the Artist? A Programme, the Association argued, "To be successful all ... efforts [to create conditions of full employment for artists] require the driving force of a powerful organisation embracing the great majority of British artists."<sup>79</sup> The latter role had been assumed during the War by the Central Institute of Art and Design.<sup>80</sup> The original impetus for the creation of the Central Institute (the Executive Committee of which held its first meeting on 6 October 1939, at the National Gallery) came from Thomas Fennimore, in his capacity as Registrar of the National Register of Industrial Art Designers.<sup>81</sup> The CIAD acted as a clearing house on all matters related to art and design. It supported schemes promoting the status and recognition of artists and designers, and assisted organisations already promoting these aims and objectives.<sup>82</sup> It owed its success to several factors. Not the least important of them was the tenacity and effectiveness of Fennimore who, as Secretary, displayed considerable qualities of organisational thoroughness. Also key was the able support that the CIAD received from Kenneth Clark, who recognised its potential

usefulness to the MoI and the WAAC.<sup>83</sup> (The latter, for example, was able to make use of the CIAD for tasks, such as the evaluation of applicants for sketching permits, for which the execution of which the Committee itself lacked sufficient time and personnel. The value of the Central Institute was even recognised by the Prime Minister. In reply to a question in the House of Commons in October 1939 about whether or not the government intended to establish a department for the arts "in order to secure that the arts do not suffer unduly through the war; that artistic effort and education be adequately maintained, and the services and powers of artists be fully and effectively utilised for the purposes of war whenever possible," Churchill answered that such a department would not be necessary because the CIAD was expected to do substantial work in achieving those very goals.<sup>84</sup>

A final, and crucial, factor in the CIAD's success was its clearly-established status as an umbrella organisation for visual artists' societies during the War. "...Those societies," Clark wrote, "were not created to meet a crisis of this kind, in which the issues are beyond the scope of isolated action."<sup>85</sup> (The ineffectiveness in this regard of such groups as the Imperial Arts League, the Royal Academy and the Arts Bureau in Oxford confirmed Clark's assertion.) As early as 2 November 1939 representatives of twenty-three of the largest art societies, associations and other groups from around the country met with the Executive Committee of the CIAD and unan-

imously agreed to give it their support.<sup>86</sup> By November 1939 Fennemore was corresponding with 165 art societies "of significant size" throughout the country, as well as with several smaller groups.<sup>87</sup> In 1942 some forty art, crafts and design organisations, and approximately 2000 artists and other eligible individuals, were affiliated with the CIAD. By the end of the War the total individual membership had doubled, to 4000.<sup>88</sup> The CIAD busied itself with the affairs of industrial designers and commercial artists as well as practitioners of the "fine" arts, and further enhanced its authority by enquiring into the career prospects of craftspeople - a group that Fennemore felt had been "particularly seriously affected" by the War.<sup>89</sup> Further, the CIAD was as interested in employment opportunities that directly supported the war effort, as it was in those that had little if any bearing on the prosecution of the War.

During its first year of operation the Central Institute was primarily occupied with helping individual artists find commissions and employment. In January 1940, for example, Fennemore reported plans to establish joint committees with other art societies "with a view to stimulating commissions for artists and designers."<sup>90</sup> A joint committee was formed with the Royal Society of Portrait Painters, for example, "to secure a greater interest in, and a more immediate demand for, the work of British portrait painters, and to use their talent in the National interest during the present emergency."<sup>91</sup> Entries on

an extensive CIAD list of wartime job suggestions (probably compiled in late 1939) included making records (of Armed Forces and home front activities, of ancient monuments, and of stereotypically "British" scenery, sites and structures); decorating Services, government, municipal and commercial buildings; working in propaganda and publicity; and teaching in art schools and evacuation centres. The CIAD also made other recommendations for the greater employment of artists in church decoration, mural painting, and the embellishment of the many hoardings and boarded-up shop windows that were becoming increasingly commonplace in urban centres, and established a committee to consider the commissioning of commemorative medals.<sup>92</sup> Fennemore also forwarded several names to the WAAC during the War. In 1940, for example, at a time when the latter had given contracts to only three women, Fennemore argued against this shortcoming.<sup>93</sup> In the spring of 1940 the Institute was processing an average of forty applications per week from artists seeking assistance.<sup>94</sup> In 1942 alone at least two hundred artists received commissions through its efforts and forty-seven were given salaried positions.<sup>95</sup>

As the absorption of more and more of the population into the Armed Services and Civil Defence gathered momentum in 1940, the CIAD came to focus its efforts less on individual artists, and more on artists as a community.<sup>96</sup> Activities in this area included the stimulation of individual, corporate, Church and state patronage.<sup>97</sup> In 1943 Fennemore sent to the

War Cabinet a suggested programme for establishing an Arts Commission with a mandate to purchase and commission art for public use, arrange exhibitions, give scholarships and awards, work in the field of art as propaganda, conduct miscellaneous research into art matters, and coordinate national festivals and celebrations.<sup>98</sup> Two years earlier, in 1941, the CIAD had set its sights on the end of the War, with a booklet produced for submission to Minister-Without-Portfolio Arthur Greenwood, outlining proposals for state support of art during the reconstruction period.<sup>99</sup>

The groups and projects discussed above adopted a multiplicity of concerns and programmes: the furthering of the war effort (through the creation of propaganda, camouflage, etc.), the commissioning of visual records, the protection of artists, and the encouraging of the development of interest in art throughout the country. The factors that tended to be the most important requirements for success included solid financial backing or business sense, access to the centres of power, mandates that identified clearly-defined objectives that were not being simultaneously pursued by several other groups of comparable or larger size, unwillingness to abandon projects in the face of practical difficulties and/or government indifference, and the possession of legitimate claims to be acting on behalf of British artists as a community. These several qualities achieved perhaps their purest expression not

in artists' groups (although the CIAD in particular combined several of them), but in the government (including the Armed Service Departments) itself.

### Government and Armed Services Employment

"While much is being done by accredited societies of artists," according to a letter written from the Royal Fine Arts Commission to the Ministry of Labour in December 1939, "the sympathetic collaboration of the Government would be invaluable...."<sup>100</sup> With the coming of the War, government ministries relied more heavily upon artists than they had in peacetime - particularly in the areas of publicity, propaganda and camouflage.

The Ministry of Information was usually responsible for publicity and propaganda. Yet the Ministry got off to a slow start, suffering through a succession of ineffectual Ministers<sup>5</sup> and quickly becoming an object of public contempt and hostility. The media made much of the discovery that the MoI employed the sinister total of 999 people, many of whom knew little or nothing about propaganda and its diffusion, or even about news reporting. Kenneth Clark later recalled that he had not expected to be given a high-profile position there be-

---

<sup>5</sup> Harold Macmillan (appointed Minister of Information when the MoI was created in 1939) was succeeded by Sir John Reith (January 1940), Duff Cooper (May 1940) and Brendan Bracken (June 1941). the latter was the most effective of the four.

cause, "as I did not read newspapers, ... I had no conception of the sanctity that journalists attach to news."<sup>101</sup> This apparently obvious shortcoming did not prevent him - one of the "too many academics and museum curators"<sup>102</sup> employed in the Ministry - from being appointed controller of Home Publicity in April 1940. In November 1939 E. McKnight Kauffer, who worked briefly for the Ministry before returning to America, wrote to his daughter, "Work here is practically non-existent, and I find when I do see heads of propaganda departments for the Government - I am appalled and disheartened by the triumph of the second-rate intelligence."<sup>103</sup> The same note of frustration was struck in a letter written by an official of Charles Scribner's Sons Ltd to Paul Nash in mid-1941, when Nash was attempting to push the Ministry into the more extensive use of reproductions of propaganda pictures:

If I had not the experience of the hopelessness of trying to interest the Ministry of Information in propaganda publications, I would offer to try and get you the necessary backing, but it needs unlimited patience, time, and wire pulling, none of which I have.<sup>104</sup>

Nonetheless, although the MoI's propaganda efforts were the objects of heavy criticism, it and the rest of the government offered far more contracts to artists than had been available before September 1939. The government's expenditure on advertising soared during the War. Its investment in press, poster and film advertising had been only about £450,000 in



1938, whereas it was estimated to be spending approximately £3,000,000 on advertising by 1943.<sup>105</sup>

The MoI Studio Division was responsible for producing most of the Ministry's art and design work. However, its salaried staff consisted mostly of layout artists, typographers, retouchers, and other technical specialists; designers or artists were usually employed on a contract basis for specific pieces of work. In October 1942 the entire Division had only forty-nine salaried employees.<sup>106</sup> The incomplete collection of Studio Division productions, now in the Public Record Office at Kew, includes almost 1900 items ranging from posters to portraits, postcards,<sup>107</sup> cartoons,<sup>108</sup> and book and magazine illustrations. Signed works (i.e., approximately half of the total) represent the work of some 219 artists.<sup>109</sup>

Artists could also look to ministries other than the MoI for work. Auxiliary Fire Service worker Leonard Rosoman, for example, spent some eighteen months in 1942 and 1943 traveling the country at the behest of the Home Office, collecting material to illustrate a fire service manual. The Publicity Department of the Ministry of Agriculture commissioned artists to record the work of the members of the Women's Voluntary Services. The Political Intelligence Division of the Foreign Office employed Terence Cuneo to make drawings depicting Nazi brutality, while Joseph Flatter also earned income there for his anti-Nazi cartoons. The Ministry of Food commissioned artists to paint between twenty and thirty murals in its British

Restaurants.<sup>110</sup> Extant records are fragmentary, but even so it is clear that the government was an important source of contract work for artists who could produce drawings and paintings for publicity and/or propaganda.

The government's employment of artists as camoufleurs was based in part on the highly creditable work that artists had done in this area during the First World War, and in part on the theory that artists were better-equipped than were most other people to analyse and remember what a target looked like from the air. It was also thought by some that artists' abilities to create the impression of three-dimensional space on flat paper or canvas could simply be reversed, enabling them to produce the illusion of unbroken terrain to hide the presence of buildings or military hardware.<sup>111</sup>

Those wishing to work in civil camouflage had little choice but to apply to the government. Few of the private camouflage companies that had appeared during the first months of 1939 were still in business in September, and those that survived into 1941 had their existence summarily terminated in that year when a fire broke out at one of them. The government - which claimed that the projects executed by some private companies "have been certainly futile and might be dangerous" - used the event as an excuse to declare all independent camouflage firms illegal.<sup>112</sup> As a result, most artists who specialised in designing civil camouflage worked for the Ministry

of Home Security's Civil Defence Camouflage Establishment at Leamington Spa,<sup>113</sup> while their counterparts in the Army were trained, under the aegis of the Royal Engineer and Signals Board, at Farnham.<sup>114</sup> (The Ministry of Aircraft Production also established its own camouflage research unit in 1941, when MAP officials became dismayed with bureaucratic delays at Leamington Spa. In the Admiralty most camouflage research and application during the first eighteen months of the War was undertaken by officers acting without orders,<sup>115</sup> and not until February 1941 did the Director of Home Operations require all British ships to be camouflaged. The Admiralty also cooperated with the naval camouflage section of the Civil Defence Camouflage Establishment.)

At the end of 1940 a Select Committee on National Expenditure concluded that War Office camouflage was inadequate in quality and quantity, due largely to a shortage of personnel. By the autumn of 1941 it was estimated that between twenty-five and thirty men were being engaged every two months as camouflage officers. Certainly the number of positions was far outstripped by the number of conscripted artists, several of whom requested the WAAC to recommend them for training at Farnham. Among the artists who at some point worked in military camouflage were William Coldstream, Frederick Gore, Ashley Havinden, Blair Hughes-Stanton, Robert Medley, Rodrigo Moynihan, Mervyn Peake, Roland Penrose, Robert Scanlan, Edward Seago, Richard Seddon and Julian Trevelyan.<sup>116</sup>

At the Civil Defence Camouflage Establishment, a survey taken at the end of 1939 indicated that Leamington Spa had a staff of between twenty and forty camouflage officers (most of them artists), and "as many assistants and a number of drudges." A 1940 Parliamentary Paper cited a large contingent of eighty-four technical officers, and during the first third of 1941 seventy-seven individuals were named as officers and technical assistants. In the autumn of 1942 (i.e., at the peak of the camouflage programme), the Directorate's Design Division employed eighty-three officers and technical assistants.<sup>117</sup> Artists, however, were not the only professionals in demand as originators of camouflage. As early as the first three weeks of September 1939 journal articles had cautioned artists that expertise in structural engineering, chemistry, physics and materials technology were as important as a background in fine or industrial art for those hoping to work in camouflage. In 1940 the scientific journal Nature lent its support to this view by stating that much camouflage was an utter failure, that too much emphasis was put upon painted rather than structural camouflage, and that the general lack of appreciation of the proper scientific background had resulted in the neglect or misapplication of such basic principles as counter-shading, disruption, coincident patterning, and deflection.<sup>118</sup> The Camouflage Advisory Panel of the Ministry of Home Security acknowledged this concern when it concluded, in April 1940, "Experience in camouflage had to be

superimposed on general artistic skill and ability and ... it took a considerable time to train a man in this special form of art...."<sup>119</sup>

Yet despite the warnings issued before the War was more than a few days old, artists flooded into camouflage training courses. The section of the Ministry of Labour's National Register that dealt only with camouflage personnel had received more than 2000 applications before the declaration of war. Only a "very small fraction" of them even got onto a waiting list, and the register was completely full by the beginning of October 1939.<sup>120</sup> At the same time art schools offered courses in camouflage theory and techniques, attracting large numbers of students who, when they finished their courses, found few employment opportunities.<sup>121</sup> The WAAC would from time to time argue the cases of artists who were trying to find work in camouflage units, but it had no official authority to do so.<sup>122</sup> In addition, as was the case in other areas of the initial war effort (notably the replacement of peacetime with wartime production and employment patterns), recognition of the need for sophisticated and extensive camouflage programmes was frequently frustrated by inefficiency and by poor communications.<sup>123</sup> Of the approximately 123 new war industry factories that were constructed in 1940 and 1941, very few were based upon plans that incorporated, from the outset, provisions for camouflage. Similarly, a government report issued at the end of 1940 was sharply critical of the

slow speed at which industrial buildings were being camouflaged.<sup>124</sup>

Opportunities for artists to engage in Civil Defence camouflage work were also adversely affected when, beginning in the spring of 1941, camouflage units came under pressure to reduce their staff lists. By that date daytime bombing by the Luftwaffe had been almost entirely replaced by night bombing, and camouflaging against night raids involved only the toning down of shiny surfaces - a task for which expertise in art was unnecessary. Britain was establishing air superiority, and radar coverage was being employed to give the Royal Air Force warning of imminent attacks. Thus, except for vulnerable sites on the south coast, the need for camouflage protection was rapidly diminishing. Beginning in late 1941 only 440 of the 800 potential targets that were essential to national defence were subjected to high-grade camouflaging. The swing of German air power away from Britain and against the Soviet Union after 1941 accelerated the growing unwillingness to continue to support a large camouflage programme within Britain. In March 1943, severely stretched for both labour and materials, and convinced that the Luftwaffe was no longer a great danger, the government ordered the reduction of camouflage work by half.<sup>125</sup>

Whereas all artists' groups had anticipated that their members could be employed in Armed Services camouflage work,

few had predicted the employment opportunities offered by the creation of unofficial war artist posts. These appointments were usually made on the spot while the artists were serving abroad, little if any attention being given to notifying headquarters in London about what were essentially discretionary acts on the part of local commanding officers. The consequent lack of documentation makes it impossible to estimate the total numbers of artists involved. The War Office, however, admitted in 1945 that there had been "many such cases" in the Army,<sup>126</sup> and there seems no good reason to assume that the situation was any different in the other services. Among the unofficial war artists were Bernard Casson (appointed "Northern Command War Artist" in 1944), Simon Elwes ("unofficial war painter" in the Middle East in 1942), Kenneth G. Browne (appointed to the same "position" in 1944), Norman Wilkinson (given a "time only" commission in the Special Duties Branch of the Admiralty) Roland Langmaid (who became "Fleet Artist in the Eastern Mediterranean" towards the end of 1942), Edward Seago (who, after his medical discharge from the Army in 1944, was given a "strictly personal invitation" from Field Marshal Alexander to record the Italian campaign), and Frank Beresford (appointed an official war correspondent with responsibility for pictorial records, with the United States Army Air Force in England). Frank Wootton was invited by Commander-in-Chief Leigh-Mallory to record the work of the Royal Air Force in France and in the Far East in 1944. Cuthbert Orde spent much

of 1940 and 1941 doing a series of portraits (possibly as many as 150) of Fighter Command personnel. William Rothenstein managed to obtain the RAF's assistance to embark on a two-year (1939-1941) tour of aerodromes throughout Britain, during which he produced 147 portrait drawings, much to the irritation of both Kenneth Clark and Keith Henderson.<sup>127</sup> (The WAAC had appointed Henderson as an official war artist to the Air Ministry in 1940, but too often he arrived at air bases only after Rothenstein had already worked there.)

The reasons the unofficial war artist appointments were made in the first place were various. Some were due to lack of awareness on the part of officers about the very existence of the War Artists' Advisory Committee. Other commanding officers believed that historically important actions would be left unrecorded in paint if officials waited for the WAAC to commission an artist to cover a distant theatre of war while another artist, fortuitously present and eager to work, was denied support. Still others were dissatisfied with what they saw as the lack of engagement or realism evident in some of the official war artists' work. Frank Wootton's appointment, for example, may well have been made because official war art was not seen by local officers "to be doing justice" to the RAF.<sup>128</sup>

The Armed Services also offered artists other, less spurious opportunities to exercise their skills. Some produced



illustrations, posters, models and displays for use in training, security, propaganda and publicity.<sup>129</sup> Industrial designers were in demand both in the Armed Services (as well as in such branches of the government as the Ministry of Aircraft Production and the Ministry of Supply. For those who were prepared to teach, positions were available in the Army Education Scheme. More than 110,000 courses and lectures were in operation in the Scheme by the end of 1943, including several in art practice and appreciation.<sup>130</sup> Among the artists who were assigned to teach them were Michael Rothenstein, Adrian Hill and Carel Weight. However, the number of applicants exceeded the number of positions, and David Bomberg was only one of many artists whose application was refused on these grounds.<sup>131</sup> Artists (some of them working under a scheme organised by the CIAD<sup>132</sup>) could also be given temporary reprieves from their regular Services duties to execute painted decorations in huts, barracks, cafes and canteens.

However, aside from jobs in camouflage and a very few other areas, art-related opportunities in the Armed Services were rarely either full-time or of long duration. The many hundred applications received by the War Artists' Advisory Committee from Services personnel unable to find any art-related work at all testified to the inability or unwillingness of the Forces to put more than a fraction of serving artists to work in their own areas of expertise. For every artist given a suitable posting there were many others left in the

ranks, hoping perhaps to be noticed by the WAAC.

### State Patronage of Art

Kenneth Clark participated in, or gave his approval to, several of the plans discussed above, whether they were launched by artists' organisations, government ministries or the Armed Services. Yet, as will be seen below and in Chapter 3, he reserved his most active interest for the initiation of other projects, within the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Information. His work with the MoI in particular raised the question of state patronage of the visual arts. An examination of this phenomenon provides a necessary contextualisation both of the complex relationship between the government and the WAAC, and of the reasons why Clark believed that it was essential for him to become actively involved in fostering state patronage of war art.

Large-scale precedents for the use of state funds for commissioning or purchasing work from artists (with the noteworthy exception of the official war art scheme during the First World War), were not plentiful.<sup>133</sup> It was estimated that in 1937 the government spent a mere 0.19% of its budget on financing the visual arts, and that the total fell even lower in 1938 and 1939.<sup>134</sup> Public funds for the purchase of art for local as well as the national collections were available but, despite the lobbying efforts of the Museums Association, no

master policy existed to coordinate such support.<sup>135</sup> Further, both the levels and the reliability of purchase grants supplied to art galleries by local government varied dangerously, and only in some cases (such as the public galleries in Leeds, Liverpool and Southampton) could compensation be found in the form of private endowments. In February 1931, for example, the Manchester City Council withdrew an annual art purchase grant of £2000.<sup>136</sup> Two years earlier, in 1929, the Walker Art Gallery in Liverpool had received its first-ever grant from the city: £750.<sup>137</sup> The art gallery in Leeds received no government grants at all for acquisitions from 1919 until 1936. At the beginning of the Second World War only the restored Manchester City Council grant was judged (by the Dartington Hall Trustees) to be adequate for its intended purposes.<sup>138</sup> The Victoria and Albert Museum administered an acquisitions assistance fund worth £1000, but divided it amongst approximately 110 to 120 provincial art collections.<sup>139</sup>

The National Portrait Gallery, the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Imperial War Museum and the British Museum all bought some work by living artists, but the sums they expended in this way were modest. Francis Watson felt justified in claiming (in 1939) that, of the £350,000 he estimated the government spent on a yearly basis "for letting us look at art," no more than £600 (0.17% of the total) went towards the purchase of work by contemporary British artists.<sup>140</sup> Eric Newton considered even this sum an overestimation, and sug-

gested a lower total of slightly more than £500.<sup>141</sup> The Tate Gallery had no purchase fund, and was forced to build up its collection through gifts, the Chantrey Bequest and the Clarke Fund. This inevitably imposed embarrassing limitations on the art that the Tate was able to acquire. Of the thirty-seven artists who were given contracts as official war artists by the WAAC, eleven entered the Tate's collection for the first time between 1939 and 1945, and fourteen were still completely unrepresented there in December 1945.<sup>6</sup>

The unsatisfactory nature of state funding inspired some private agencies to take compensatory measures. The Pilgrim Trust, for example, made grants to such organisations and projects as the Royal Academy and Recording Britain, and extended financial aid to art exhibitions.<sup>142</sup> Less helpful was the National Art-Collections Fund, which expended a mere 1.5% of the almost £160,000 that it spent on art between 1928 and 1937, on work by living British artists.<sup>143</sup> The wartime difficulties of the Contemporary Art Society have already been noted.

The suspension of state purchase grants to the national collections in 1939 therefore encouraged Kenneth Clark consider means of reforming government support of the arts. The government's reciprocal interest in him was clearly based in large part upon his status within the art establishment. He had been Keeper of Fine Art at the Ashmolean<sup>a</sup> Museum (1931-

---

<sup>6</sup> See Appendix 1, part 8.

1934) before becoming Director of the National Gallery in 1934 at the remarkably young age of 29 years. Also in 1934 he had been appointed Surveyor of the King's Pictures. His concern for artists' welfare was genuine and well-known, and no one was to do more during the War to protect artists' interests and keep them working. (It was with good reason that Cyril Connolly, as Editor of Horizon, asked in 1943, "Just how much culture would we have had without Sir Kenneth Clark?"<sup>144</sup>)

Yet at the MoI Clark was to occupy two key positions (head of the Films Division, and Controller of Home Publicity) for which he had, by his own admission, virtually no obvious qualifications. What he did have were social connections. He wielded much influence, being a personal friend of Neville Chamberlain, an advisor to Winston Churchill, and an occasional companion of the King and Queen.<sup>145</sup> Also important was the fact that he was a talented outsider (one of many in the Ministry of Information) who was not closely associated with any political faction. Raymond Williams has argued the importance of such considerations in his discussion of the Arts Council as an intermediate or "arm's length" branch of government:

The British State has been able to delegate some of its official functions to a whole complex of semi-official or nominally independent bodies because it has been able to rely on an unusually compact and organic ruling class. Thus it can give Lord X or Lady Y both public money and apparent freedom of decision in some confidence ... that they will act as if they

were indeed State officials.<sup>146</sup>

This "erasure of politics" as "a central feature of state involvement in the visual arts in Britain"<sup>147</sup> constitutes a vital element in the analysis of the relationship between the machinery of government on the one hand, and such bodies as the WAAC and the BBC on the other. (As an MoI official noted at the beginning of the War: "For the purpose of war activities the BBC is to be regarded as a Government Department, [although] I wouldn't put it quite like that in any public statement.")<sup>148</sup> Clark, like John Reith (the first Director of the BBC), was an example of Williams' "Lord X": a man in whose basic attitudes the government could have confidence, even if he might disagree with specific policies and pieces of legislation.

The reasons for the bestowal of that confidence went beyond Clark's strictly social and professional credentials to include consideration of the interests and instincts that those credentials implied. He shared at least one of the important underlying assumptions by which the government evaluated its relationship with, and responsibility to, the public: the belief that central authority must (in the words of Robert Eccleshall, in his analysis of English Conservatism) "transcend particular interests in search of a communal norm in which harmony is attainable."<sup>149</sup> Especially in wartime this view of the nation being united in purpose and expectations was seen as crucial. The national government exemplified the

absorption of individual difference within a unified wartime state, insofar as it was and remained a coalition government; and the Ministry of Information invested much of its energy in the business of promoting an image of an undivided country in which everyone had a role to play to ensure military victory. (As will be seen in Chapter 4, and especially in Chapter 5, this unity was premised largely upon certain pervasive qualities of generic Britishness - qualities that the War Artists' Advisory Committee implied in much of its art.) These same assumptions regarding the establishment of a communal norm through the transcending of particular interests had also been shared by another "Lord X". John Reith, at the BBC, had avoided the multiplicity of class-based cultures, had used the BBC "to give authority to cultural values, [and] not to represent listeners' interests," and had acted on the principal that "few know what they want, and very few what they need."<sup>150</sup>

In his own area of expertise, Clark's sympathy for the government's emphasis on national cohesiveness was manifested in a sharing of Reith's suspicions about a multiplicity of popular and minority cultures. In place of the latter he envisioned a nationally-shared culture of artistic excellence. (In later years, for example, he argued that John Maynard Keynes was a more praiseworthy Director of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts than Lord Macmillan had been because Keynes "was not the man for wandering minstrels and amateur theatricals. He believed in excellence."<sup>151</sup>) The

Penguin Modern Painters booklets (of which he was the Editor) were intentionally inexpensive and targeted at a general audience in order to combat what he described as "the current idea that modern painting is unintelligible and that modern Art Galleries are for the few selected initiates."<sup>152</sup> He was as wary of the more esoteric streams of modernism as he was of unabashedly "popular" art (i.e., art for which the inexperienced viewer would not require lessons in appreciation). The first of these phenomena was "of little interest to anyone except a very small and usually unimportant group of people,"<sup>153</sup> while the second too often descended into vulgarity or sentimentality. In the same vein, although he applauded the AIA's Everyman Prints project as encouraging patronage of art "by the people,"<sup>154</sup> he was suspicious of the Association's faith in popular opinion. "No doubt it will be necessary to tempt the people with scraps," he wrote in The Cornhill Magazine in 1945, "but they must not be spoon fed or they will never learn to feed themselves, and will soon become too lazy even to open their mouths."<sup>155</sup>

Clark's assumption of the desirability of a shared national culture reflective of his own standards of artistic quality made him attractive to a government that had a similar conception of social structure.<sup>7</sup> The attraction was mutual,

---

<sup>7</sup> Ironically, as will be seen in Chapters 3 and 4, in the short term Clark's approach to war art angered several officials within both the Treasury and the MoI, who resented the unwillingness of the WAAC to provide images that had obvious value as propaganda. In the long term, however, this



Clark recognising that in wartime only the government would be in a position to act as an art patron on a large scale, Obtaining a position in the wartime government would not only put him in a strong position to give employment assistance to artists; it would also enable him to exercise a significant degree of influence over the education of public taste. "Public taste can be educated," he wrote at the end of the War, after half-a-decade of experience with state support of art through the WAAC, "and it is in this, rather than in direct patronage, that the state can help the artist."<sup>156</sup>

Clark was particularly concerned to have a large degree of influence over the government's wartime employment of artists because of fears that he harboured about the ability of a government ministry to differentiate between good and mediocre art. If any government intended to become a major patron of contemporary art, it would need expert guidance. Evidence of the potential pitfalls of state patronage seemed to Clark to have been demonstrated by the murals produced for the Federal Art Project. Although he hoped that a British version of the FAP "would have a wonderful effect on English art in general,"<sup>157</sup> he was troubled by the murals' aesthetic worth:

We are told that they are the source of a  
more than Tuscan local pride, that they

---

very unwillingness was interpreted as a tangible example of the larger national image of tolerance and openness that the government was hoping to project.

are executed with a devotion and received with an enthusiasm not paralleled since fifteenth-century Italy. How good they ought to be! But they aren't. They are just deadly boring....<sup>158</sup>

Clark therefore flatly opposed the creation of a Ministry of Fine Arts. He preferred instead (as he told a Ministry of Reconstruction committee) the creation of a council under the jurisdiction of one person - a "patronage controller" - who would be independent of partisan politics and who would possess the same qualities of discernment that had been manifested by great individual patrons of the past.<sup>159</sup> "Discovering and encouraging talent is a notoriously chancy business," he later wrote in his autobiography, adding that this was a task best left to the discerning individual rather than to a bureaucracy.<sup>160</sup> (Just as his belief in the importance of establishing a communal cultural norm corresponded to one of Robert Eccleshall's characteristics of English Conservatism, so did his notion of a patronage controller find its echo in the identification, by Eccleshall and others, of the importance that contemporary society attached to the idea of experts - from Clark to J.M. Keynes - as the custodians of the national interest.<sup>161</sup>) It was with this patronage blueprint in mind that Clark was to focus his energies upon influencing government art programmes in general, and the War Artists' Advisory Committee in particular.

Clark's views on both the need for some form of state support of the arts were not formulated in a vacuum; they re-

flected important streams of contemporary critical opinion. The need for the government to become an active patron of art was stressed in 1939 by, among others, Raymond Mortimer, A.P. Herbert, and even Clive Bell. The latter had predicted in 1936 that only blandness and the eventual death of art would result from state interference, but once the War had begun he reversed his opinion. "I have never imagined that a government, or any other public body, was likely to be a judicious patron of the arts," he wrote in October 1939, "but now it is not so much a matter of patronage, of encouragement, as of arresting destruction." In addition, critics who echoed Clark's fears about the dangers of state interference or control included Storm Jameson, Herbert Read, George Orwell, Alex Comfort, Osbert Sitwell, Graham Bell (who worried that state patronage would harness painting to class interests), and Peter Settle (disturbed at what he saw as the government's elevation of the frequently cheap entertainment of the Entertainments National Service Association into an officially sanctioned form of national service, while "high" culture remained a national frivolity).<sup>162</sup> Still other commentators endorsed Clark's claim that state patronage was less likely than private patronage to lose touch with social reality and thus sponsor insupportably esoteric art, but that it must be carefully regulated by a discerning individual rather than by bureaucrats who would politicise or regiment art, or by someone whose taste was insufficiently "developed" or broad.<sup>163</sup> Clark's views were

challenged comparatively seldom, and almost always by supporters of types of art with which he was not in sympathy. C.R.W. Nevinson, for example, referred to the Director of the National Gallery as "Kenneth Napoleon Clark," and contended, "It would be better to be gassed by the enemy than breathe in a hothouse atmosphere of museum cranks and didactic favouritism."<sup>164</sup>

Clark's conviction that state patronage in wartime could be utilised to establish a national constituency for the artists whose work he admired, was one that he felt was too important to be left to others, whether in artists' organisations (with whose interests and tastes he was often in disagreement) or in the Armed Services and government ministries (which, though expected to be the largest employers of artists, did not appear likely to value aesthetic importance over short-term instrumentality). Artists' groups tended to be handicapped by a plethora of disadvantages from which branches of the government were less likely to suffer: limited acceptance by other groups, inability to promote projects that did not contribute directly to the war effort, shortages of money, and restricted access to the centres of power. He therefore welcomed the opportunity, presented early in 1939, to work closely with the Ministry of Labour on the matter of employing artists in the impending conflict.

Kenneth Clark and the Ministry of Labour

Compilation of the Ministry of Labour's Central Register had begun in January 1939. Its various component sections were intended for use in provisioning government departments and the Armed Services with persons having "scientific, technical, professional and other administrative qualifications," who were willing to do wartime work offered to them as a result of enrolment on the Register, and who did not have more pressing national service duties to perform.<sup>165</sup> On 22 February 1939 Humbert Wolfe (Deputy Secretary at the MoL) convened a meeting to discuss the merits of including artists, authors, journalists and actors on the Register. The participants in the meeting were of the general opinion that "the few [artists] who would be needed by the Government in wartime for posters, camouflage, etc., could best be obtained by private inquiry,"<sup>166</sup> but they nonetheless concluded with the decision to invite Clark to submit his views on the subject.

At the end of March Clark suggested holding an informal conference of himself and five others involved in art, government and business, to determine the likely extent of the demand for artists during a large-scale war. The membership of the resulting committee struck a balance between artists, designers, publicists, and men with extensive knowledge of the younger artists of the day.<sup>8</sup> They met together for the first

---

<sup>8</sup> The members were Clark (the Chairman), advertising executives Jack Beddington, William Crawford and Shaw Wildman, Thomas A. Fennemore (then the Registrar of the National Regis-

time on 14 June 1939 and resolved that their committee should be responsible (with input from the London Group, the New English Art Club, the Royal Academy, the Royal Institute of Oil Painters, the Royal Society of British Artists, the Royal Society of Painter-Etchers and Engravers, and the Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours) for creating a national register of artists who would be suitable for employment in official publicity and propaganda. In late summer, after digesting the comments of the canvassed groups, the Ministry of Labour concluded that it would establish a body, under Clark's chairmanship, for the purpose of considering the general employment of artists in the event of war.<sup>167</sup>

War was by then a virtual certainty. On 23 August the Nazi-Soviet Non-aggression Pact was signed, the British government insisting that this worrying event would not deter it from going to the aid of Poland if, as was expected, Hitler invaded that country. The first meeting of the Artists and Designers Committee was held on 1 September, two days before war was declared.<sup>9</sup> On 8 September (after there had been three meetings<sup>168</sup>) Clark indicated that the Committee had completed

---

ter of Industrial Art Designers), E. McKnight Kauffer (useful because he was a member of the Board of Trade's Council for Art and Industry), Henry Moore and Randolph Schwabe (Slade Professor of Fine Art at University College, London).

<sup>9</sup> Twelve of its members were in attendance: Clark, Jack Beddington, R.H. Bevan and W.G. Vaughan (of the MoI's General Production Division), George Butler, William Crawford, T.A. Fennemore, E. McKnight Kauffer, E.M.O'R. Dickey, and B.M. Power, C.J. Maston and I.W. Morgan (MoL).

its work, having enrolled 140 artists and designers on its lists.<sup>169</sup> The Committee was accordingly dissolved after only one month of existence, although the work of registering late submissions continued on an informal basis. By the end of the year, 207 artists and designers, along with several photographers, had registered, and 88 more had been invited to do so.<sup>170</sup>

However, Clark was troubled that the resulting register, intended as it was to address problems of employment in the fields of publicity and propaganda, failed almost entirely to focus MoL interest upon the other types of art-related employment identified by, for example, the Arts Bureau in Oxford. During the summer he had been besieged with increasingly anxious enquiries from artists who wanted to know what plans were being made to employ them.<sup>171</sup> At the same time he recalled the British war artists of the First World War, as well as his enjoyment of the large exhibition of Canadian war pictures that had been held at Burlington House in 1917.<sup>172</sup> Even before Britain had declared war on Germany he had effected the evacuation of pictures from the National Gallery, and could therefore concentrate his attention, during the autumn of 1939, upon the problems faced by artists in general as unemployment soared. As he wrote to Humbert Wolfe at the MoL on 3 October,

The situation [of artists] is so serious  
that I have been wondering if it would not  
be desirable for the Government to take

some action; rather a wider application than the mere employment of artists for camouflage and propaganda. I have in mind something like the federal scheme for artists carried out in America during the last five years, though ours would no doubt have to be on a less ambitious scale. I studied this scheme both times I was in America and brought back a number of documents connected with it. I think it is capable of modification to suit our own needs.<sup>173</sup>

(Clark had long been intrigued with the FAP but had, before the beginning of the War, concluded that lack of government interest precluded its transplantation to Britain.<sup>174</sup>)

Wolfe's reply to Clark stated that there had been thought given for some time past, at the MoL, to a wide-ranging approach to the problems faced by artists in wartime, and that consideration was at that moment being given to the establishment a committee to look into the question. Less than two weeks later Ernest Brom, another official at the Ministry, wrote to Clark in terms which made it clear that the two men had already discussed the composition and purposes of such a body in some detail.<sup>175</sup> The outcome was the creation of the Committee on the Employment of Artists in War-time (CEAW), which held its first meeting on 18 October 1939 under the chairmanship of Sir Hubert Llewellyn Smith, an experienced civil servant with substantial expertise in finance and the employment of artists.<sup>10</sup> These were important qualities for

---

<sup>10</sup> Llewellyn Smith had been Permanent Secretary to the Board of Trade from 1907 to 1919, Chief Economic Adviser to the government from 1919 to 1927, and a member of the Board of



the chairman of a committee with a mandate "to consider and report what action can be taken to utilise the services of artists and designers whose ordinary means of livelihood has been cut off or seriously diminished by the war."<sup>176</sup> Thus, fewer than seven weeks into the War the Ministry of Labour, despite its earlier reservations and its lingering suspicion that few artists would be employed by the government,<sup>177</sup> had an artists' section on its Central Register and had approved the formation of a committee dedicated to the employment of artists on as large a scale as possible.

The provision of unearned monetary grants to needy artists was excluded from the CEAW's terms of reference, despite the fact that the various artists' charities lacked the resources to cope with the flood of applicants that turned to them for assistance.<sup>178</sup> Instead, the CEAW adopted a tripartite approach to the task of putting artists to work. Firstly they considered the employment of artists in jobs made necessary by the War, approaching this task by subdividing potential job types into three categories: war publicity in the form of posters, other advertisements, and propaganda (an area already addressed by the Artists and Designers Committee); graphic records of the War; and camouflage. Each of these areas was made the subject of a separate section of the MoL Central

---

Trade's Council for Art and Industry. The others in attendance at the first meeting of the CEAW were Clark, Percy Jowett, J.J. Mallon (Warden of Toynbee Hall), Frank Pick, Charles Tenyson, R.E. Gomme (MoL; Secretary) and S.G. Holloway (MoL; Assistant Secretary).

Register. The first two were compiled by committees chaired by Clark, while the register of artists suitable for camouflage work was the province of a Home Office committee under Percy Jowett. Unfortunately, government ministries and the Armed Services tended to ignore directives to use the three registers when hiring artists.<sup>179</sup> This, along with the suspicion that the immediate war-related demand for artists had been overestimated, was the CEAW's justification for elevating its second idea for employing artists (by reviving pre-war employment opportunities in education and industry) above that of encouraging the creation of specifically war-related jobs.

Thirdly, the CEAW proposed the creation of "useful work improvised so as to find scope for the energies of artists who cannot be absorbed" into new, war-related jobs, or who would not benefit from the encouragement of the continuation of pre-war jobs. It was judged probable that, as the War progressed, demand for such work (notably the creation of visual history of the conflict) would increase.<sup>180</sup> According to the draft for the CEAW's first interim report, dated 8 November 1939,

It has been represented to us [the Committee], and we believe it to be true, that an appreciable amount of artistic work of great value to the nation, which cannot, or at least, is not, undertaken in normal times because of its prohibitive cost, could, if a suitable organisation were created for the purpose, be carried out at much less cost in war time....<sup>181</sup>

Work of "national importance" was thus broadly defined to

include all work that made "the best use of the artistic powers of the country instead of letting them run to waste."<sup>182</sup> It seems likely that Kenneth Clark, especially given his interest in the Federal Art Project, was the driving force behind the idea of severing the assumed connection between wartime jobs, and the immediate needs of the government and the Armed Services. His praise for the FAP resurfaced in the CEAW's first interim report, which specifically cited the Project both as a laudable example of state patronage of fine art during a difficult period, and as a valid precedent for wartime patronage not directly related to national defence. The report recognised that the British government could not, especially during a major war, hope to match the funds poured by the American government into the FAP, but it was hoped that a scaled-down version of the project could be instituted.<sup>183</sup>

Acting in cooperation with the Ministry of Labour, Kenneth Clark had organised and set in operation, within a month of the outbreak of war, registers (far more extensive in scope than the MoL had originally thought necessary) of artists who were ready to work not only as propagandists, publicists and camoufleurs, but also as teachers, commercial artists, designers, and even as recorders. By insisting that specialists hired to do official work must be included on the registers, he avoided the danger that the mechanics of employing artists might become casual and haphazard; and by estab-

lishing all three registers within a ministry he assured them of funding and official support. It is unlikely that any individual or organisation acting outside official circles could have done so much, so effectively and quickly.

The next step was to ensure that the register concerned with the compilation of a visual record of the War was not neglected by a government that might see little justification for employing artists other than as propagandists, publicists or camoufleurs. On the twin assumptions that he would fit smoothly into government ministries, and that he had the will and ability to turn wartime patronage into an important tool with consequences for post-war society, Clark approached the Ministry of Information at the end of August 1939 with plans to hire artists to make visual records of the War. The result was the creation of the War Artists' Advisory Committee.

## Chapter 2: Endnotes

1. George Orwell, "London Letter," Partisan Review, 8 #2 (March-April 1941), p.111.
2. Oron J. Hale, The Great Illusion, 1900-1914 (series: The Rise of Modern Europe: A Survey of European History in its Political, Economic and Cultural Aspects from the End of the Middle Ages to the Present (New York/Evanston/London: Harper & Row Publishers, 1971), pp.289-290.
3. Alex Comfort, Now (new series), #2 (1944), n.p.
4. James Boswell, The Artist's Dilemma (series: New Developments, #1) (London: The Bodley Head, 1947), p.8.
5. John Stirling-Marshall, "Report of the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Imperial Arts League," Imperial Arts League Bulletin, #12 (7 June 1940), p.187.
6. Jan Gordon, "Art and Artists: Plans for 1940," Observer (31 December 1939), p.2.
7. David Bomberg, unpublished letter to the Editor of The Times, 20 October 1939 (Tate: David Bomberg papers, TAM 22 I 160/350).
8. Editor, "The Arts in War-time," Britain To-day #47 (21 February 1941), p.1.
9. Sacheverell Sitwell, in Civil Defence Artists, Civil Defence Artists: First Exhibition (London: Cooling Galleries, 1941), n.p.
10. Both quotations are taken from Samuel Heald, "The Artist in War [letter to the Editor]," Spectator, 163 #5804 (22 September 1939), p.413. See also A.W. Dodd, "The Artist in War [letter to the Editor]," Spectator, 163 #5807 (13 October 1939), p.508.
11. Boswell, The Artist's Dilemma, op.cit., p.14.
12. [Editor], "Artists in War - and Peace," Listener, 23 #574 (11 January 1940), p.60.
13. For example: anonymous, "Artists and the War," Country Life, 86 (25 November 1939), p.538; and anonymous, "Artists and War Service," Studio, 119 #566 (May 1940), p.153.

14. Eric Newton, in his Introduction to the series brochure (London: BBC, 1939, p.i) wrote, "The Fine Arts are up for trial. The charge against them is that they are useless, or at least, unnecessary: and that of recent years they have become divorced from life."

15. Goronwy Rees, "Letter from a Soldier [letter to the Editor]," Horizon, 1 #7 (July 1940), p.468.

16. Anonymous, "Seven of the New War Pictures at the National Gallery," Tatler and Bystander, 21 May 1941, pp.282-283.

17. Mass-Observation's File Report #55 - "Building" (March 1940) is a helpful summary of unemployment amongst architects during the War, although it is somewhat unfair in its analysis of the RIBA.

18. Ernestine Carter, "Letter from London," Magazine of Art, 33 #1 (January 1940), p.33.

19. Membership drops of approximately 20% seem to have been the norm. However, wartime membership lists sometimes included the names of individuals who were unable to afford their fees. The most useful source for information of this type is A.C.R. Carter, comp., The Year's Art... for 1940, 1941, 1942-1944, and 1945-1947 (London: Hutchinson and Co (Publishers) Ltd, [1940,1941,1944,1947]).

20. Contemporary Art Society, Report 1940-1 (England: The Curwen Press, [1942]).

21. Anonymous, "Members' Notices: Subscriptions," and "New Members Join Each Week," [AIA] Bulletin, #58 (December 1939), [p.4]; anonymous, "A Year's Activity," [AIA] Bulletin, #59 (January 1940), [p.2].

22. RA, Minutes of the 14 March 1940 and 9 April 1941 meetings (Minute Book, 2 March 1937-9 May 1944, RA Archive).

23. Royal Society of Painter-Etchers and Engravers, Minutes of the 1 March 1940 and 22 January 1943 meetings (Minute Book, 1918-1954); Reports of the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, 1903-1953 (both, Bankside Gallery).

24. Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours, Minutes of the 13 September and 8 November 1939 meetings (Council Minute Book, 5 January 1921-12 June 1946) (Bankside Gallery).

25. Royal Water Colour Society Art Club, Minute Book, 26 March 1934-1984 (Bankside Gallery). The exhibition records of the other artists' groups named in the text are summarised in

Carter, The Years Art, 1940...., The Year's Art, 1941...., The Year's Art, 1942-44, and The Year's Art, 1945-47...., op.cit..

26. For example: "Memorandum: The Employment of Artists During the War Period," (26 October 1939; memorandum presented to the CEAW), p.8 (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

27. Richard Seddon to Paul Nash, 20 May 1941 (Tate Archive: Paul Nash papers, 7050.1172).

28. Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts: A Report Sponsored by the Dartington Hall Trustees (London/New York/Toronto: Geoffrey Cumberlege/Oxford University Press, 1946), p.45.

29. Geoffrey Holme, "Art and the Church," Studio, 119 #563 (February 1940), p.33.

30. Anonymous, Artists and the Church in War Time (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

31. Anonymous, "The Central Institute of Art and Design," Art & Industry, vol.32 (1942), p.102.

32. London Transport awarded Eric Kennington a contract to do a series of six posters showing the portraits of transport workers who had performed heroic acts (Seeing It Through; Baynard Press, 1944; press release in GP/55/1(B), pp.85-86). In 1942 John Summers consulted with the WAAC about artists who would be suitable for contracts to paint interior views of the Summers factories (Minutes of the 30 December 1942 meeting). That same year the Aeronautical Research and Sales Corporation announced intentions to engage an artist to paint a picture that could be reproduced for sales intended to benefit the Allied Air Forces Benevolent Fund (Minutes of the 18 February 1942 meeting).

33. The artists involved were Charles Cundall, Francis Dodd, Ethel Gabain, William Grimmond, Henry Lamb, Henry Rushbury and Harold Workman; see Peter Davies, A Northern School: Lancashire Artists of the Twentieth Century (Bristol: Redcliffe, 1989), pp.125-126.

34. IAL, draft letter to CIAD, 6 June 1942; IAL, Minutes of the 16 December 1941 meeting (Minute Book, 7 February 1935-8 January 1948) (both, Bankside Gallery).

35. IAL: see two anonymous articles in the Imperial Arts League Bulletin, #9 (August 1939): "Pencil Notes" (p.139), and "Artists and National Service" (pp.148-149).

36. E.M.O'R. Dickey to Mr. Bamford (MoI), 5 June 1940 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/232).

37. RA, Minutes of the 14 and 28 November 1939 meetings (Minute Book, op.cit.).

38. Francis Watson, Art Lies Bleeding (London: Chatto & Windus, 1939), pp.171-196. The quotation is taken from p.188.

39. H.F. Ellis, "Art For Your Own Sake," Punch (4 July 1945), p.9.

40. Kenneth Clark, The Other Half: A Self-Portrait (London: John Murray, 1977), p.23; see also Clark, "The Future of Painting," Listener, 14 #351 (2 October 1935), p.543.

41. The Academy argued that only WAAC artists were being given access to restricted facilities. In actual fact, in December 1940 twenty-eight of its own members already held sketching permits that entitled them to such access; see GP/46/40. Minutes of WAAC meetings, especially those of 12 and 26 February, and 12 and 26 March 1941, include several references to the Royal Academy's plans. See also Sir Edwin Lutyens (President, RA) to the Right Hon. Sir Alexander Hardinge (Buckingham Palace), 2 December 1940 (RA Archive: RAC/5/89), as well as relevant correspondence in MoHS (in PRO): HO 186/879.

42. Gilbert Ledward to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 3 January 1940 (GP/72/A(2), p.155).

43. Royal Society of British Sculptors, Annual Report of the Council, With Accounts for the Year Ending the 31st December, 1940 ([no publication data given]), p.10; Annual Report of the Council, With Accounts for the Year Ending the 31st December, 1942 ([no publication data given]), p.8.

44. Anonymous, "Executive Meeting," National Society of Art Masters Journal, 12 #3 (January 1940), p.52. See also Art and Entertainment Emergency Council, The Arts in Wartime (brochure; dated in pen 6 May 1940) (Tom Harrisson Mass-Observation Archive: Box Art 2, File C); and anonymous, "Entertainment and Culture: Aims of New Council," Times (12 December 1939).

45. Anonymous, "Executive Meeting," op.cit., pp.52-53.

46. Anonymous, "F.A.M.E. for Britain," [AIA] Bulletin, #61 (May 1940), [p.1]).

47. Lionel Esher, "The Plot to Save Artists," Times Literary Supplement, #4370 (2 January 1987), pp.12-13. John Lehmann, one of Esher's advisors on the project, mistakenly as-



sumed that the goal was to keep selected artists out of the Armed Forces entirely, "not so much to prevent a blind waste of talent, as to guard against the possibility that those who held unpopular and unorthodox opinions might be deliberately silenced by being drafted straight into the Forces" (Lehmann, I Am My Brother: Autobiography II (London: Longmans, Green and Co Ltd, 1960), p.30).

48. Lord Esher to Paul Nash, 25 March 1940 (Tate Archive: Paul Nash papers, 7050.135). Esher published the results of his negotiations in a letter to the Editor of The Daily Telegraph on 9 March 1940. For a condemnatory reaction to the collapse of Esher's plans, see Robert Herring, "Editorial," Life and Letters To-day, 25 #32 (April 1940), p.3.

49. Paul Nash, "Letter from Oxford," Listener, 122 #568 (30 November 1939), p.1065. Other relevant letters and documents are in the Tate Gallery Archive (7050.122- 7050.125, 7050.127, and 7050.132-7050.147), and in the National Art Library (English Manuscripts, 86.X.25: [Paul Nash correspondence], A-C).

50. Arts Bureau in Oxford, Statement (September 1939) (Tate Archive: Paul Nash papers, 7050.145. See also Tate Archive: 7050.122 (Paul Nash to Kenneth Clark, 23 September 1939).

51. The Tate Archive holds three letters from Lord Esher to Paul Nash in which Esher requests dossiers on artists being considered by his committee (Paul Nash papers, 7070.122 (26 October 1939), 7050.124 (14 November 1939) and 7050.134 (27 November 1939). For Nash's communications with Clark, see: Arts Bureau in Oxford, Report (November 1939) (Tate Archive: Paul Nash papers, 7050.145; and National Art Library: English Manuscripts, 86.X.25: [Paul Nash Correspondence], A-C).

52. Paul Nash to F. Morton Shand, n.d. (Tate Archive: Paul Nash papers, 7050.125).

53. Nash, "Letter from Oxford," op.cit., p.1067.

54. For example: Vice-Chancellor, Magdalen College, University of Oxford to Paul Nash, 16 January 1940 (Tate Archive: Paul Nash papers, 7050.133).

55. Paul Nash to Gordon Bottomley, [c. late March 1941], in Claude Collier Abbott and Anthony Bertram, eds., Poet & Painter, being the correspondence between Gordon Bottomley and Paul Nash, 1910-1946 (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1955), p.220.

56. T.A. Fennemore to Paul Nash, 10 January 1940 (Tate Archive: Paul Nash papers, 7050.132; see also British Council to Nash, 3 December 1939, 7050.142).

57. A.E. Cooper and Adrian Bury, "Glorious London [letter to the Editor]," Connoisseur, 106 (1940), p.265.

58. For example: anonymous, "Making Records of Famous Buildings: War Plan for Artists," National Society of Art Masters Journal, 12 #2 (December 1939), p.43; MoL: CEAW, "Second Interim Report," (21 December 1939), (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939), p.4-6. See also: CEAW, "Scheme for Recording Changing Aspects of England"; Kenneth Clark to Thomas Jones (Pilgrim Trust), 16 December 1939; Clark to R.E. Gomme (MoL), 18 December 1939 (all, NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

59. The Chairman of the Record was Lord Greene (the Master of the Rolls), and its Council of Management included Kenneth Clark, Osbert Lancaster and Lord Justice Mackinnon. It was advised by the Central Council for the Care of Churches, the Council for the Preservation of Rural England, the Courtauld Institute, the Georgian Group, the National Trust, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings and the Warburg Institute.

60. The project was sponsored by the Barclay Perkins, Courage, Watney and Whitbread breweries. See: anonymous, "The Londoner's England in War-time: Brewers' Scheme for Record by Artists," Times (15 July 1944), p.6; S. John Woods, "Letter to a Young Artist," Our Time, 4 #6 (January 1945), p.11; and CIAD, Report on Nine Years' Work of the Central Institute of Art and Design (London: The Euston Press, 1948), p.3.

61. Hubert Llewellyn Smith, "Artists in War-time: A Pictorial Record of Britain [letter to the Editor]," Times (1 February 1940), p.6; and Thomas Jones to Hubert Llewellyn Smith, 20 December 1939 (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

62. [Arnold Palmer], quoted in anonymous, "The Pilgrim Trust Scheme for Recording Britain," [AIA] Bulletin, #67 (October 1941), [pp.1-2].

63. The Trust ultimately found enough of value in its collection to warrant the publication of four volumes (1946-1949) of reproductions under the title Recording Britain (Arnold Palmer, ed., [London]: Oxford University Press/ Geoffrey Cumberlege, in association with the Pilgrim Trust), and a Recording Scotland volume in 1952 (James B. Salmond, ed., Edinburgh/London: Oliver and Boyd, for the Pilgrim Trust).

64. E.M.O'R. Dickey to Kenneth Clark, 15 February 1940 (GP/72/A(2)).

65. W. Warner (War Artists and Illustrators) to Kenneth Clark, 19 December 1939 (GP/51/5).

66. E.M.O'R. Dickey to Mr. Phillips (MoI), 15 January 1940 (GP/51/5); E.J. Embleton to John Rodgers (Commercial Relations Department, MoI), 11 December 1940 (PRO: INF 1/232).

67. Anonymous, "The Artist Puts Punch Into Propaganda Picture," World's Press News (12 June 1941).

68. The War Artists and Illustrators also included artists (such as Frank Wootton and Charles Pears) from whom the WAAC was later to commission or purchase work. Further details are in GP/72/A,(2), GP/55/43, and anonymous, "'Pep' in War Pictures: War Artists and Illustrators Ltd," Art & Industry, 33 #196 (October 1942), pp.90-94.

69. Anonymous, "The Wider Issues," [AIA] Emergency Bulletin, #3 ([late September-early October 1939]), [p.2].

70. This is explored at length in Robert Radford, Art for a Purpose: The Artists' International Association, 1933-1953 (Winchester: Winchester School of Art Press, 1987), Chapter 5.

71. "Memorandum: The Employment of Artists During the War Period," op.cit., p.1; and Mass-Observation: "Impact of the War on Art and Artists: First Four Months of the War" (typescript; 15 January 1940) (Tom Harrisson Mass-Observation Archive: Box Art 2, File B). The National Register of Industrial Art Designers itself established internal committees to enquire into the employment of artists in the areas of camouflage, commemorative medals, design research in industry, and the design and decoration of emergency shop fronts (anonymous, "The National Register of Industrial Art Designers," [CIAD] Bulletin, 1 #1 (31 December 1940), pp.27-28). The groups involved in the Unemployment Advisory Committee had a combined membership of 4374.

72. Anonymous, "Employment for Artists," [AIA] Emergency Bulletin, #3 (late September-early October 1939), [p.1].

73. Anonymous, "National Art Council," [AIA] Emergency Bulletin, #3 (op.cit.), [p.1].

74. For example: anonymous, "Artists for Propaganda," #70 (March 1942), and anonymous, "Propaganda for War Effort," #71 (May 1942) (both, [AIA] Bulletin).

75. Details about these exhibitions are given in various issues of the AIA's Bulletin, in Radford (Art for a Purpose, op.cit.), and in Linda Morris and Robert Radford, The Story of the AIA: Artists International Association, 1939-1953 (Oxford: Museum of Modern Art, 1985).

76. Such a council had been envisioned as early as December 1939 by a Ministry of Labour committee (MoL: CEAW, "Second Interim Report" (21 December 1939), p.4 (NG Archive: ibid.). See also "Memorandum: The Employment of Artists During the War Period," op.cit., pp.3-5; and the records of the AIA Murals Committee, in the Tate Gallery Archive, AIA 7043.2.5.

77. For example: anonymous, "Travelling Exhibition No.2," included in a supplement ("Activities Since 1938") to [AIA] Bulletin #72 (July 1942).

78. Anonymous, "1940/41," [AIA] Bulletin, #64 (February 1941), [p.1].

79. AIA, Full Employment for the Artist? A Programme, reprinted in Morris and Radford, The Story of the AIA, op.cit., p.73.

80. Correspondence relevant to this thesis is held in the archive of the Art Department of the Imperial War Museum (GP/46/105, GP/46/81/1); the NG Archive (Central Institute, 1939, Central Institute, 1940-1947, Central Register, 1939); the PRO (MoI file INF 1/232, and Ministry of Home Security file CAB 124.426); the Tate Archive (Paul Nash papers, 7050.132- 7050.147, 7050.297); and the Bankside Gallery (miscellaneous papers).

81. T.A. Fennemore, "Artists' Works in War: Proposal to Establish a Centre in London [letter to the Editor]," The Times (22 September 1939), p.6; Fennemore to Kenneth Clark 13 October 1939 (NG Archive: Central Institute, 1939).

82. CIAD, "The Central Institute of Art and Design," p.2 (typescript outline of information on membership, and on the CIAD's Council and objectives; NG Archive: Central Institute, 1939).

83. Kenneth Clark to R.M. Barrington-Ward (Times Assistant Editor), 18 October 1939 (NG Archive: ibid.).

84. Hansard, 352 (25 October 1939), column 1440.

85. Kenneth Clark, "Artists in War: A Central Institute, [letter to the Editor]," Times (21 October 1939), p.4.

86. CIAD, "Copy of the Resolution Passed by the Meeting of Delegates Held on 2nd November 1939" (NG: Central Institute, 1939).

87. Minutes of the 9 November 1939 meeting of the CIAD Provisional Committee.

88. Tennyson, quoted in "The Central Institute of Art and Design" (anonymous article published in Art & Industry, 32 (1942), p.101). Lists of the organisations affiliated with the CIAD are available in various sources, including A.C.R. Carter, The Year's Art, 1945-1947, op.cit., p.37. See also Jack Lindsay, British Achievement in Art and Music (series: Achievement Books, Noel Carrington, general ed.) (London: The Pilot Press ltd, [1945?]), p.27.

89. T.A. Fennemore to W.P. Gibson (Keeper, National Gallery), 17 April 1940 (NG Archive: Central Institute, 1940-1947).

90. T.A. Fennemore to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 24 January 1940 (PRO: INF.1/232).

91. Other activities of these sub-committees are given in anonymous, "The Central Institute of Art and Design," [AIA] Bulletin, #61 (May 1940), [p.2].

92. John Gloag, "Shop Windows and the Black-out," Listener, 23 #575 (18 January 1940), pp.114-115; correspondence dated June 1940, in GP 46/81.

93. T.A. Fennemore to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 22 April 1940 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/232).

94. Ministry of Reconstruction, Central Institute of Art and Design. Reconstruction Arts and Crafts (PRO: CAB 124/426).

95. Anonymous, "Employment," [CIAD] Bulletin, 1 #4 (February 1943), p.98.

96. Charles Tennyson, quoted in anonymous, "The Central Institute of Art and Design," op.cit., p.102.

97. CIAD, "Employment of Artists" ([1939]) (NG Archive: Central Institute, 1939).

98. T.A. Fennemore to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 8 May 1940 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/232).

99. CIAD, Memorandum to the Right Honourable Arthur Greenwood, P.C., M.P., His Majesty's Minister Without Portfolio ([1941]) (Copy in PRO: CAB 124.426).

100. Royal Fine Arts Commission to MoL, 4 December 1939 (GP/46/17).

101. Clark, The Other Half, op.cit., p.10.

102. Ian McLaine, Ministry of Morale: Home Front Morale and the Ministry of Information in World War II (London/Boston/Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1979), p.39.

103. Quoted in Mark Haworth-Booth, E. McKnight Kauffer: A Designer and His Public (London: Gordon Fraser, 1979), p.80.

104. John Carter (Charles Scribner's Sons Ltd) to Paul Nash, 10 June 1941 (Tate Archive: Paul Nash papers, 7050.1183).

105. Anonymous, "Government Spent £750,000 on Advertising in First Year of the War," [unidentified newspaper or magazine clipping in the E.J. Embleton scrapbook (IWM: Art); dated 5 September 1940]; Charles Rosner, "Publicity Panorama 1942-48," in Frank A. Mercer and Charles Rosner, Modern Publicity 1942-48 (annual of Art & Industry) (London/New York: The Studio Publications, [1948/1949])), p.11.

106. MoI (in PRO): INF 1/87, and INF 1/638. Information on the jobs performed by full-time Studio Division employees is included in a letter from E.J. Embleton (head, Studio Division) to R. Henderson Blyth, 14 January 1944 (GP/55/218), and in another from E.M.O'R. Dickey to R.M.Y. Gleadowe, 27 January 1940 (GP/55/2); see also the organisational diagram included in Embleton's scrapbook (IWM: Art). John Armstrong, George Bissill, Charles Ginner, Laura Knight, R.V. Pitchforth, Henry Rushbury and John Nash were among the painters who were given contracts for posters. Several of the professional designers given contracts are discussed in Joseph Darracott and Belinda Loftus, Second World War Posters (London: Imperial War Museum, 1972). For correspondence with artists, see: R.A. Bevan (Head of the General Production Division, MoI) to Laura Knight, 3 November 1939 (GP/55/74); MoI (in PRO): INF 1/637; E.M.O'R. Dickey to W.P. Hildred, 4 January 1940 (GP/ 55/3); and Bevan to John Nash, 27 December 1939; Dickey, memorandum, 19 January 1940; Nash to "Bobby" [R.M.Y. Gleadowe?], 13 February 1940; and Nash's secretary to Dickey (all, GP/55/7).

107. MoI (in PRO), INF 1/647, INF 1/648, INF 1/650. The MoI's loss of interest in postcards, especially after the first year of the War, is summarised in John Fraser, "Propaganda on the Picture Postcard," Oxford Art Journal, 3 #2 (October 1980), pp.44-45.

108. Kem to Mr. Grubb (MoI) [September 1940] (MoI (in PRO), INF 1/134); MoI: Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee on the Use of Cartoons, Report (3 December 1940) (MoI (in PRO), 1/250); Darracott and Loftus, Second World War Posters, op.cit., p.40.

109. The collection at Kew consists of 45 oils of war actions and activities, 14 caricatures, 25 portraits, 333 posters, 153 drawings for books and booklets, 544 drawings for such magazines as Ditty Box, Envoy, Neptune and Echo, 83 illustrations for the MoI periodical The War in Pictures, 148 political cartoons, 50 works intended for publicity use in Latin America, 68, 34 and 61 illustrations of the War at sea, the War on land, and the War in the air, respectively, 17 invasion of Europe scenes, 80 "general war pictures," 17 illustrations for publicity about the Empire, 53 drawings on the theme "Under Nazi Rule," and 44 miscellaneous drawings. These paintings and drawings (stored in INF 3) were all commissioned and retained by the Ministry of Information between 1939 and 1946.

110. Leonard Rosoman: Rosoman, "Developments in Style VI," London Magazine (August 1962). The resulting illustrations were published in the Home Office Manual of Firemanship (London: HMSO, 1943). MoA: E.M.O'R. Dickey to R.C. Langford (MoA), 9 May 1940 (GP/55/44, p.16). Cuneo: IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: T. Cuneo (tape-recorded interview), reel #2. Flatter: Eric Newton, Art for Everybody (series: Britain Advances, #7) (London/New York/Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co, for the British Council, 1943), p.24.

111. Robin Darwin, "Artists in Camouflage," (18 February 1943) (MoHS (in PRO): HO 186/1648).

112. Typical was the Industrial Camouflage and Research Unit, established by John Buckland-Wright, Denis Clarke-Hall, W. Goldfinger, William Hayter, Roland Penrose and Julian Trevelyan; see Trevelyan, Indigo Days, op.cit., pp.112-114, and Guy Hartcup, Camouflage: A History of Concealment and Deception in War (Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1979), pp.55-56. Also: Mass-Observation, "Impact of the War on Art and Artists," op. cit., p.27; and Select Committee on National Expenditure, Fourteenth Report (London: HMSO, 1940), p.8.

113. Documents detailing the administrative history of the Civil Defence Camouflage Establishment, and its final establishment at Leamington Spa, are in MoHS (in PRO), HO 191/3, and HO 186/1987.

114. Camouflage in the Army is summarised in Hartcup, Camouflage, op.cit., pp.76-78; and in the Select Committee on National Expenditure, Fourteenth Report, op.cit., pp.6-7.

115. Peter Scott (RNVR), whose art was included in the WAAC's collection, documented his camouflage design work, for the Admiralty's newly-acquired destroyers, in his book The Eye of the Wind (Great Britain: Hodder and Stoughton, 1961/1966 (revised edition)).

116. 1941 estimate: anonymous, "War Work and National Service for Artists," [AIA] Bulletin, #67 (October 1941), [p.2]; Mass-Observation, "Impact of the War on Art and Artists," op. cit., p.27. Coldstream: IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: William Coldstream (tape-recorded interview, reel #1. Gore: Hartcup, Camouflage, op.cit., p.80; Havinden: Darra-cott and Loftus, Second World War Posters, op.cit., p.17. Hughes-Stanton: Hartcup, p.80. Medley: Whitechapel Art Gallery, Robert Medley: Retrospective Exhibition; Paintings, Drawings and Sculpture, 1928-1963 (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 1963), n.p. Moynihan: Royal Academy of Arts, Rodrigo Moynihan: A Retrospective Exhibition (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1978), p.11. Peake: John Watney, Mervyn Peake (London: Michael Joseph, 1976), p.122. Penrose: Roland Penrose, Scrap Book, 1900-1981 (Great Britain: Thames and Hudson, 1981), pp.130-131. Seago: Jean Goodman, Edward Seago: The Other Side of the Canvas (London: Collins, 1978), pp.149,151,156. Seddon: Richard Seddon, A Hand Uplifted (London: Frederick Muller Limited, 1963), p.34. Trevelyan: Indigo Days, op.cit.. Artist camoufleurs working in North Africa's western desert included E.C. Calligan, John Codner, Edward Bainbridge-Copnall, John Hutton, Blair Hughes-Stanton and Robert Medley. Among those working on the south coast of England while preparations were being made for the Normandy invasion were Edward Seago and Ashley Havinden.

117. 1939: Mass-Observation, "Impact of the War on Art and Artists," op.cit., pp.26-27. 1940: Select Committee on National Expenditure, op.cit., p.4. 1941: WAAC, GP/72/E(1), p.32. 1942: Section 6.2 of Ministry of Home Security (in PRO): HO 191/3. The staff in 1941 consisted of three administrators, thirty-three camouflage officers, fifteen senior technical assistants and sixteen junior technical assistants. In 1942 the staff included one chief and one deputy chief camouflage officer, one senior and one deputy design officer, thirty-three camouflage officers, and one principal and fourteen senior and junior technical assistants.

118. For example: T.A. Fennemore, "The Artist's Function in Time of War," Art & Industry, 27 #161 (November 1939), p.198; and anonymous, "Camouflage in Modern Warfare," Nature, 145 #3686 (22 June 1940), pp.949-951.

119. MoHS: Camouflage Advisory Panel, Minutes of 3 April 1940 meeting (MoHS (in PRO): HO 186/171).



120. Mass-Observation, "Impact of the War on Art and Artists," op.cit., p.27; anonymous, "No More Camouflage Workers Needed," Times (5 October 1939), p.4.

121. T.A. Fennemore to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 17 June 1940 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/232). For an example, see letters to David Bomberg from the National Society of Painters, Sculptors, Engravers and Potters (14 September 1939) and the Home Office (3 February 1941), in the Tate Gallery Archive's Bomberg papers, TAM 22I 160/350 and TAM 22K, 164/350.

122. E.M.O'R. Dickey to R. Grimshaw, 7 September 1941 (GP/55/Go-Gu - R. Grimshaw); GP/46/99.

123. Select Committee on National Expenditure, Fourteenth Report from the Select Committee on National Expenditure (London: HMSO, 1940; reprinted 1941), p.7 (printed in Parliamentary Papers 1939-1940, Volume 3, pp.589-597). See also MoHS: HO 186/1985, and HO 186/1989 (both, in PRO).

124. Hartcup, Camouflage, op.cit., p.54; Select Committee on National Expenditure, op.cit., p.8.

125. Hartcup, op.cit., pp.55-57.

126. Colin Coote to S.S. Trenaman (Finance Division, MoI), 1 January 1945 (GP/55/384).

127. Casson: WAAC, Minutes of the 5 July 1944 meeting. Elwes: D. Williams [?], (Office of the Minister of State, Cairo) to Cyril Radcliffe (Director-General, MoI), 6 May 1942 (GP/55/248). Browne: correspondence in GP/55/384. Wilkinson: Wilkinson, A Brush With Life, (London: Seeley Service & Co Ltd, 1969), p.126. Langmaid: Minutes of the 16 December 1942 meeting. Seago: Horace Shipp, Edward Seago: Painter in the English Tradition (London: Collins, 1952), p.28; and Goodman, Edward Seago, op.cit., p.182. Beresford: American and British Commonwealth Association, Exhibition of Pictures and Sketches of the U.S. Army Air Force. E.T.O. by Frank E. Beresford (U.S. Army War Correspondent No.1242) (London: published under the auspices of the American and British Commonwealth Association, 1946), n.p. Wootton: John Blake, "Introduction," The Aviation Art of Frank Wootton (David Larkin, ed.) (New York/Toronto/London: Bantam Books, 1976), n.p.; Rodney Steel, "The Man Who Loves to Draw Planes," Royal Air Force News, #493 (27 February - 11 March 1980), pp.12-13, 10 [sic]. Orde: Cuthbert Orde, Pilots of Fighter Command: Sixty-four Portraits (London/Toronto/Bombey/ Sydney: George P. Harrap & Company Ltd, 1942), pp.7-8. Rothenstein: GP/55/12, and the artist's book of drawings done at the air bases: Men of the R.A.F. (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942).

128. Steel, "The Man Who Loves to Draw Planes," op.cit., pp.12-13,10 [sic].

129. Examples include: Sidney Arrobus (IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: S. Arrobus (tape-recorded interview); E.A. ("Chris") Wren, David Langdon and Russell Brockbank (Artists in an Age of Conflict: E.A. ("Chris") Wren (tape-recorded interview); Frank Wootton (Alan Ross, The Colours of War: War Art 1939-45 (London: Jonathan Cape, 1983), p.182); Mervyn Peake (Watney, Mervyn Peake, op.cit., p.122); Abram Games (Darracott and Loftus, Second World War Posters, op.cit., p.32); Paul Methuen (Methuen, Normandy Diary: Being a Record of Survivals and Losses of Historical Monuments in North-Western France, Together with Those in the Island of Walcheren and in that Part of Belgium Traversed by 21st Army Group in 1944-45 (London: Robert Hale Limited, 1952); and Terence Cuneo (anonymous, "Artists in Uniform," Art & Industry, 34 (1943), p.75). Various kinds of military work for artists are identified in Waldemar Johansen, "Military Uses of Art," School Arts Magazine, 43 #1 (September 1943), p.28.

130. Anthony Polonsky, "Cultural Life in Britain During the Second World War," in Polish Academy of Sciences, Committee of Historical Studies, Institute of History, Inter arma non silent Musae: The War and Culture, 1939-1945 (Czeslaw Madajczyk, ed.) (Warsaw: Panstwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1977), p.468. The number of comparable positions with the Army Bureau of Current Affairs discussions programme seems to have been much smaller.

131. Michael Rothenstein, "'Can We Be Educated Up To Art?'," Horizon, #40 (April 1943), pp.270-277; Adrian Hill, "Art and the Army," Studio 128 #617 (August 1944), pp.55-57. The War Office's letter of rejection to David Bomberg, dated 19 April 1942, is in the Tate Archive: TAM 22K, 165/350.

132. For example: anonymous, "Artists in Uniform: L.A.C. Tom Gourdie of the R.A.F.," Art & Industry, 36 #213 (March 1944), p.90.

133. An overview of these commissions is given in Dennis Farr, English Art, 1870-1940 (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), pp.327-335.

134. Watson, Art Lies Bleeding, op.cit., pp.220-221.

135. In 1942 the Association proposed the creation of a Museum and Art Gallery Grants Board, funded by the national government. This proposition was refined and submitted to the Ministry of Education, in 1945, as Museums and Art Galleries: A Post-war Policy.

136. Davies, A Northern School, op.cit., pp.101,110.

137. Aside from an 1892 bequest of £2000 from Lord Derby, the Walker had always depended entirely on sales from its annual autumn exhibitions for purchase funds and, as noted in Chapter 1, exhibition sales were by the 1930's extremely low. See John Willett, Art in a City (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, for the Bluecoat Society of Arts, 1967), pp.68-69.

138. Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts, op.cit., p.24,45.

139. Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts, op.cit., pp.23-24,104. Of these, approximately thirty to forty were small art collections that were maintained in municipal institutions other than art galleries and museums.

140. Watson, Art Lies Bleeding, op.cit., pp.80-83.

141. Newton, Art for Everybody, op.cit., p.15.

142. Royal Academy, Minute Book, 2 March 1937-9 May 1944, pp.328-329,430, 513 (Bankside Gallery).

143. Watson, Art Lies Bleeding, op.cit., p.243.

144. [Cyril Connolly], "Comment," Horizon, 7 #37 (January 1943), p.3.

145. See the numerous references in the indexes of his two volumes of autobiography, Another Part of the Wood: A Self-Portrait (London: John Murray, 1974), and The Other Half, op.cit.

146. Raymond Williams, "The Arts Council," Political Quarterly, 50 #2 (1979), p.165. Williams makes a comparable, highly illuminating argument in his analysis of the social significance of the Bloomsbury Group. He argues that the members rejected commentators' identification of ~~its~~ them as constituting a clearly-defined group defined in any terms other than personal friendships between "free and civilized individuals." In this regard, Williams concludes, "They were a true fraction of the existing English upper class. They were at once against its dominant ideas and values and still willingly, in all immediate ways, part of it" ("The Bloomsbury Fraction," in Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays (London: Verso Editions and NLB, 1980), pp.148-169).

147. Nicholas Pearson, The State and the Visual Arts: A Discussion of State Intervention in the Visual Arts in Britain (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1982), p.104. Pearson traces this systematic displacement of overt politics from the

exercise of state power, and its replacement by an equally political (but better-disguised) "informal consensual benevolence," in the organisation of the corporate state, and in the division of powers between the Crown, the House of Lords, the House of Commons, and levels of regional and local government.

148. Jean Seaton, "Broadcasting and the Blitz," in James Curran and Seaton, Power Without Responsibility: The Press and Broadcasting in Britain, (Great Britain: Routledge. 1981, pp.136-160. In another chapter ("Reith and the Denial of Politics," pp.117-135) Seaton traces Reith's determination to rise above the political parties and squabbles that he held in contempt, as well as the parallel development of such practices as the Corporation's placing of emphasis upon "a succession of royal broadcasts as the triumph of outside broadcasting and actual reporting" during a decade - the 1930's - characterised by social discontent and upheavals.

149. Robert Eccleshall, "English Conservatism as Ideology," Political Studies, 25 #1 (1977), pp.62-83.

150. "To give authority": Jean Seaton, "Social Revolution," in Curran and Seaton, Power Without Responsibility, op.cit. pp.161-171; "few known what they want": Reith, quoted in Seaton, "Reith and the Denial of Politics," op.cit., p.124.

151. Kenneth Clark, "Art and Democracy," Cornhill Magazine, 161 #965 (July 1945), p.371; Clark, The Other Half, op.cit., p.26.

152. Kenneth Clark, quoted in Roy and Gwen Shaw, "The Cultural and Social Setting," in Boris Ford, ed., The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain. Volume 9: Since the Second World War (Cambridge/New York/New Rochelle/Melbourne Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p.6.

153. Kenneth Clark, interviewed in Rom Landau, Love for a Country: Contemplations and Conversations (London: Nicholson & Watson Limited, 1939), p.284.

154. Quoted in Radford, Art for a Purpose, op.cit., p.120.

155. Clark, "Art and Democracy," Cornhill Magazine, op.cit., p.370. See also Clark's "Art and Society," published in Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art, Proceedings: The 100th Anniversary Academic Convocation of the Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art (New York, N.Y.: Cooper Union, 1959. This was the partial basis for an article of the same name that appeared in The Cornhill Magazine, 171 #1025 (Autumn 1960), pp.307-325.

156. Kenneth Clark, "Art After the War," World Review (c.1945), p.48.

157. Kenneth Clark to Humbert Wolfe, 3 October 1939 (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

158. Clark, "Art After the War," op.cit., p.47.

159. Clark's 1941 disparagement of a ministry of fine arts, made on the BBC programme The Brains Trust, is recorded in Edwin Lutyens, John Rothenstein et al, "Should There Be A Ministry of Fine Arts?," Studio 125 #599 (February 1943), pp.51,59. His argument to the Ministry of Reconstruction is summarised in a letter (10 November 1941) from J.J. Hawkes to Mrs. Hamilton (Ministry of Reconstruction (in PRO): CAB 124/425). Clark's views on State patronage were summarised and criticised by Herbert Furst in his article "On Creative Patronage and Its Control," Apollo, 39 (1944), pp.147-148.

160. Kenneth Clark, The Other Half, op.cit., pp.136-137.

161. Robert Skidelsky, "Keynes and the Reconstruction of Liberalism," Encounter (April 1979), p.32; Eccleshall "English Conservatism as Ideology," op.cit., pp.62-83.

162. Raymond Mortimer, "First Aid for the Artist," New Statesman and Nation, 18 #440 (29 July 1939), p.176; A.P. Herbert, "The Artist in War-Time: A Bridge-Head in Whitehall? [letter to the Editor]," Times (28 October 1939), p.4; Clive Bell, "A Ministry of Arts," New Statesman and Nation, #451 (14 October 1939), p.518, and "Art and the State. [VII]: The Failure of State Art," Listener, 16 #406 (21 October 1936), pp. 745-747; Storm Jameson, "Why Not a Ministry of Fine Arts?," Fortnightly Review, new series, 148 #887 (November 1940), p.449; Herbert Read, "The Fate of Western Art," Listener, 23 #587 (11 April 1940), pp.740-741; Polonsky, "Cultural Life in Britain," op.cit., p.449 (quoting Orwell); Alex Comfort, Art and Social Responsibility: Lectures on the Ideology of Romanticism (London: The Falcon Press Limited, 1946); Osbert Sitwell, "Letter to My Son," Horizon, 7 #39 (March 1943), p.170; Graham Bell, The Artist and His Public (series: Hogarth Sixpenny Pamphlets, #5) (London: The Hogarth Press, 1939), p.17; Peter Settle, "Art and Entertainment: A National Service?," Our Time, 1 #5 (July 1941), pp.23-26.

163. Adrian Allinson, "From the General to the Particular, Part VI," Artist, 26 #6 (February 1944), p.124; and Lutyens, Rothenstein et al, op.cit., pp.,51,59. See also Charles Tenneyson's article "The State and the Arts," Studio, 125 #599 (February 1943), pp.57-58.

164. "Kenneth Napoleon Clark": C.R.W. Nevinson, quoted in Philip Mayes, The Origins of an Art Collection (unpublished manuscript; n.d.) (IWM: Art); "better to be gassed": Nevinson, "The Artist in Peace and War: His Work Vitalised by Experience [letter to the Editor]," Daily Telegraph (16 March 1940), p.6. Complaints about biased patronage assumed their most menacing aspect not in diatribes against Clark, but in 1944 attacks on the low quality (here a euphemism for "modernism") of the pictures included in exhibitions circulated by the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts. A series of letters to The Times in March culminated in a demand in Parliament in 1944 that CEMA either lose its funding altogether or be restricted to supporting music and drama (Hansard, 397 (15 February 1944), columns 27-28).

165. B.M. Power (Assistant Secretary, MoL) to Kenneth Clark, 25 February 1939 (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939). For the original announcement of the preparation of the various registers, see MoL, National Services Guide (1939), p.46.

166. Undated typescript summary of the MoL meeting of 22 February (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

167. MoL: CEAW, "Note A: Position Regarding the Artists' Section of the Ministry of Labour's National Register" ([1939]); Kenneth Clark to B.M. Power, 10 August 1939; Power to Clark, 19 and 24 August 1939 (NG Archive, ibid.).

168. The Minutes of the first four (of five) meetings of the committee (1, 5, 7 and 27 September 1939) are in the NG Archive: ibid. The eight classifications were noted in MoL: CEAW, Minutes of the 18 October 1939 meeting.

169. Kenneth Clark to the Earl of Perth (MoI), 8 September 1939 (NG Archive: Ministry of Information Artists Advisory Committee, 1939).

170. NG Archive ibid. includes two typewritten lists of artists who were invited to enroll, or who had enrolled on their own behalfs, on the Central Register, in September and October 1939.

171. Kenneth Clark to B.M. Power, 10 August 1939 (op. cit.).

172. Kenneth Clark, "Introduction," in New Metropole Arts Centre, Memorial Exhibition: The War Artists (Folkestone: New Metropole Arts Centre, 1964), n.p. According to Carel Weight, who had been friendly with Clark since before the War, he (Clark) had been talking about his admiration for the best of the First World War pictures and hoped, in the event of a war, to establish a scheme that would continue the work begun by

the official artists of the 1914-1918 conflict.

173. Kenneth Clark to Humbert Wolfe, 3 October 1939 (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939). For concise information on the Federal Art Project (1935-1943) of the Works Progress Administration, see especially Richard D. McKinzie, The New Deal for Artists (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973).

174. For example: Kenneth Clark to David Bomberg, 1937 (quoted in William Lipke, David Bomberg: A Critical Study of His Life and Work (London: Evelyn, Adams & Mackay Ltd, 1967), p.82; and Richard Cork, David Bomberg (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1987), p.222).

175. Humbert Wolfe to Kenneth Clark, 4 October 1939; Ernest Brom to Kenneth Clark, 16 October 1939 (both, NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

176. Ernest Brom to Kenneth Clark, 16 October 1939, op. cit. The Minutes for the first, second, third, fourth, fifth and ninth meetings of the CEAW (18 and 25 October, 1, 8 and 16 November, and 21 December 1939), and the agenda for the tenth meeting (4 January 1940) are all in the NG Archive: Central Register, 1939. The process of reconstructing the creation and workings of both Clark's Artists and Designers Committee, and H. Llewellyn Smith's CEAW, is complicated by the variant committee names that appear on extant documentation, and by confusion in the minds of MoL and MoI officials regarding the personnel and responsibilities of the two committees.

177. For example: anonymous, "Information from the Ministry of Labour and the Home Office," [AIA] Bulletin, #58 (December 1939), [p.2].

178. MoL: CEAW, draft for "First Interim Report" (November 1939), [pp.1,5]; Minutes of the Committee's 18 October 1939 meeting and the "Chairman's Preliminary Memorandum" ([1939]), [p.2] (both, NG Archive: Central Register, 1939); and W.H. Williams, "Artists in Wartime [letter to the Editor]," Times (4 April 1940), p.5. Information on the monies dispersed by artists' charities is given in A.C.R. Carter, comp., The Year's Art, 1940... (London: Hutchinson and Co. (Publishers) Ltd, [1940], p.37; The Year's Art, 1942-1944... ([1944]), p.37; and The Year's Art, 1945-1947... ([1947]), p.37; and in Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts, op.cit., p.57.

179. See especially the CEAW's draft for its "First Interim Report," op.cit., [pp.4-5]. Addition information is given in the Minutes of its 25 October and 11 November 1939 meetings, in its working paper "Note B: Camouflage," and in a letter from Kenneth Clark to the MoL's C.J. Maston (1 November 1939) (all, NG Archive: Central Institute, 1939).

180. MoL: CEAW, Minutes of 25 October 1939 meeting.

181. MoL: CEAW, draft for "First Interim Report," op. cit., [p.6].

182. MoL: CEAW, Minutes of 18 October 1939 meeting.

183. MoL: CEAW, draft for "First Interim Report," op.cit., [p.6]. Ironically, the scale of operations of the FAP itself was reduced during the early years of the War.



### Chapter 3

#### WAAC: Formation, Structure and Policies

"The first duty of an artist in wartime is the same as his duty in peace: to produce good works of art."

-Kenneth Clark, 1939<sup>1</sup>

#### Formation of the WAAC

Kenneth Clark was encouraged, in his hope to convince the government to hire artists to record the War, by the example of large-scale state support of art in Britain during the First World War. He was not particularly intrigued by the war art project as it had been pioneered by C.F. Masterman (the Director of Propaganda at Wellington House), nor as it had been continued by John Buchan at the Department of Information (created in 1917).<sup>2</sup> He was instead interested in the British War Memorials Committee, set in motion by Lord Beaverbrook following the latter's investiture as the first Minister of Information (1918). Beaverbrook had based the British War Memorials Committee upon his Canadian War Memorials Fund, which he had established in 1917 for the purpose of recording and memorialising the exploits of Canadian soldiers in Europe.<sup>3</sup>

Clark is known to have admired the Canadian project greatly,<sup>4</sup> and could not have been unaware of the parallel

British project. A few days before the Second World War began to went to the Ministry of Information with a proposal to form a committee - roughly comparable in intention and scope to the British War Memorials Committee - to record the War in art. The Ministry of Labour's Artists and Designers Committee was yet to have its first meeting, and formation of the Committee on the Employment of Artists in War-time was still seven weeks in the future.

In an age when photography and film-making were highly developed, his insistence that artists were needed as recorders may have appeared somewhat disingenuous to skeptical MoI officials. In his autobiography Clark himself later admitted, "...I was not so naive as to suppose that we should secure ... a record of the war that could not be better achieved by photography." Similarly, in 1964 he wrote in a catalogue text for a retrospective exhibition of war art, "My aim, which of course I did not disclose, was simply to keep artists at work on any pretext, and, as far as possible, to prevent them from being killed."<sup>5</sup> In September 1939, however (and for the remainder of the War), he insisted on the importance of the War Artists' Advisory Committee as a body responsible for acquiring documentary and (especially) interpretive records. Whereas photographers and film companies were expected to compile an objective record, only artists were deemed capable, by Clark, of producing the records that would capture the feel of the War. In this he had the support of a number of sympathetic

critics. According to Herbert Read, for example, "We do not go to the pictures of Paul Nash, Wyndham Lewis, William Roberts, Henry Lamb or Stanley Spencer for an accurate record of what actually took place in the Great War."<sup>6</sup> Eric Newton agreed: "...The camera cannot interpret, and a war so epic in its scope by land, sea and air, and so detailed and complex in its mechanism, requires interpreting as well as recording."<sup>7</sup> A parallel argument was used by poets and novelists advocating the hiring of "official" war writers to supplement the descriptive, non-interpretive work of war journalists.<sup>8</sup>

Nonetheless, even if a strong case could be mounted for spending government funds on the compilation of an interpretive record of the War, Clark's proposal to house the project within the MoI was problematic. Little serious consideration seems to have been given to the use of "fine" art or art exhibitions at the Ministry before Clark first broached his idea.<sup>9</sup> The most obvious disadvantage of the MoI as a home for the proposed committee was the fact that it (the Ministry) had been created specifically to concern itself with publicity and propaganda. Neither of which activities were discussed at length by Clark in his original proposal.<sup>10</sup> In addition (as repentant Ministry officials later argued), there was no logical reason to assume that the MoI should have any interest in gathering historical records. However it transpired that the Historical Section of the War Cabinet - which was assuming the task of writing the official history of the War - was unwill-

ling to take responsibility for compiling even a film history of contemporary events, and in fact was prepared to argue at length that such a task fell within the jurisdiction of the MoI.<sup>11</sup> Clark could therefore not have expected to receive a warm welcome had he opted to present his plan to the War Cabinet itself.

As will be seen, the uneasy alliance of the WAAC and the MoI deteriorated over the course of the War, as Ministry dislike of the Committee grew; but in the autumn of 1939 the advantages of ensconcing his nascent committee within the MoI seemed to Clark to outweigh the potential problems. Among these advantages was the fact that the Department (later Ministry) of Information during the First World War had assumed responsibility for visual records, and so Clark could at least refer to a precedent. In addition, the first Minister of Information during the 1939-1945 conflict was Harold MacMillan, who had a history of interest in the arts (and who in January 1940 was to become the first chairman of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts). Also important as a consideration was the presence of Raymond Needham in the upper administration of the MoI. Needham had been Secretary to Lord Beaverbrook when the latter had established the British War Memorials Committee some twenty years earlier. Finally, the MoI was a recently-created organisation that had, especially in its early months, a poorly-defined structure and set of responsibilities. "...The Board of Education might have been

more suitable originally [as a home for the WAAC]," noted an Ministry official in August 1940, "[...but] the job came to us in the period when the ambit of this Ministry was regarded as limitless...."<sup>12</sup>

The MoI was thus, in the early weeks of the War, willing to be talked into providing a home for the WAAC. Yet even while he was first presenting his proposal, Clark was almost overtaken by other events. The War Office was at that time asking the Treasury for funding to hire an artist able to do recording work in France.<sup>13</sup> There was also speculation that three more artists might soon be wanted to do records work for the Armed Services. With this possibility in mind, the Ministry of Labour asked Clark to expand his Artists and Designers Committee (hitherto concerned only with publicity and propaganda) to include three more members in order to make it better qualified to recommend artists for recording purposes. Clark added Muirhead Bone, Percy Jowett and Walter Russell. A few days later, at the end of September, they presented to the Ministry of Labour a list of forty-three artists' names, along with a secondary list of eight other names.<sup>1</sup>

The expansion of the Artists and Designers Committee, endangered Clark's plans at the Ministry of Information because Bone, Jowett and Russell had already been suggested by him for inclusion on the proposed MoI committee. When the Deputy Director-General at the MoI learned of the expansion of the Art-

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix 1, part 6.

ists and Designers Committee his first reaction was to postpone indefinitely all of his recently-formed plans to promote the WAAC project at the MoI.<sup>14</sup> Clark, however, disapproved of the idea that a group (the MoL Artists and Designers Committee) that had been established to do one job (recommend artists for work in publicity and propaganda), should add three new members and change its mandate completely (to the recommending of artists to record the War). In this he had the agreement of the Ministry of Labour.<sup>15</sup> The latter therefore dissolved the Artists and Designers Committee at the end of September, after the Committee had submitted its lists of names of artists who were deemed suitable to record the War. Only then did the MoI allow its own plans to proceed.<sup>16</sup>

Thus, towards the end of September 1939 the MoI had agreed in principle to the establishment of what was to become the War Artists' Advisory Committee.

This agreement was not subsequently threatened by the formation (in October) of the Ministry of Labour's Committee on the Employment of Artists in War-time, or even by the CEAW's decision (made during the second half of October) to put Clark in charge of again suggesting artists suitable for compiling a visual history of the War. This was because the CEAW's mandate was a very broad one, the Committee having been formed largely in response to Clark's urging of the MoL to examine all the employment possibilities that could be opened to artists. The use of artists to record the War was only one

such idea, and was certainly not the raison d'être of the CEAW. Further, the CEAW subcommittee was charged only with compiling a register and with making recommendations; it had no authority actually to administer a visual records project. In addition (and unlike the relationship between the nascent WAAC and the Artists and Designers Committee three weeks earlier), the proposal to found the WAAC had received approval in principle from the MoI before the CEAW even held its first meeting. There was therefore no question of the MoI again threatening to abandon the project altogether, as it had done during the latter half of September.

Speed was nonetheless of the essence. As part of a project to compile a collection of war pictures for presentation to the National Maritime Museum, the Admiralty had already applied for, and obtained, Treasury funding to hire Muirhead Bone on a full-time basis.<sup>17</sup> Clark had consented to act as art advisor on the Admiralty project,<sup>18</sup> presumably to ensure that it not be allowed to compromise his own plans for the establishment of the WAAC. By the end of the first week in November the War Office, too, had requested Treasury sanction for a greatly expanded version of its original war art proposal, the latter now altered to include the hiring of four full-time artists (rather than only one, as had earlier been proposed). Therefore, to prevent the WAAC from being stillborn, Clark speeded up his negotiations with the MoI. He met on 2 November with A.P. Waterfield (the Deputy Director-General of the Min-

istry) and with E.M.O'R. Dickey (of the Home Publicity Division). The three of them concluded that an MoI advisory committee was much to be preferred over the Service Departments acting independently to engage their own artists. They argued that the painting of war pictures should be classified as publicity, and wartime publicity was the responsibility of the MoI. They also contended that the Ministry was better placed than the Service Departments to make maximum publicity use of war pictures, and that any delay on the part of the Service Departments in commissioning artists might result in the permanent loss of opportunities to record events of historic interest.

Subsequent negotiations had the desired results. By mid-November the Home Office and all three Armed Services had formally agreed to send representatives to the war art committee at the MoI, and to make use of it as an advisory body for the selection of any artists they might decide to hire. On 16 November the Minister of Information formally created the WAAC. Two days later the Service Departments and the Home Office were invited to nominate one representative apiece to the Committee,<sup>19</sup> these representatives being expected to ensure that events and personalities that fell under the individual jurisdictions were adequately represented in art acquired by the WAAC.

The first meeting of the WAAC was finally held at the National Gallery on the afternoon of 23 November 1939, under



Clark's chairmanship. The Committee's terms of reference, established prior to the meeting, were:

To draw up a list of artists qualified to record the war at home and abroad. In co-operation with the Service Departments, and other Government Departments, as may be desirable, to advise on the selection of artists from this list for War purposes and advise on such questions as copyright, disposal and exhibition of works and the publication of reproductions.<sup>20</sup>

The War Office was represented by Colin Coote, a journalist who knew his way around Fleet Street<sup>21</sup> and who had a strong personal interest in art. His newspaper connections were particularly important because the MoI intended the WAAC to cultivate good press relations and ensure that war artists' works were reproduced in print at every available opportunity. R.M.Y. Gleadowe (representing the Admiralty, where he was employed in the Awards and Honours Section) also had a strong interest in art, and had been Slade Professor at Oxford. W.P. Hildred, from the Air Ministry, appears to have had little involvement in the work of the Committee.<sup>22</sup> He departed from it early in 1940, as did the original Ministry of Home Security representative, T.B. Braund.

Muirhead Bone, Percy Jowett and Walter Russell had been selected by Clark to sit on the WAAC by virtue of their "good artistic judgment" and because they would "fairly represent different shades of artistic opinion."<sup>23</sup> In Clark's estimation Bone had three particularly attractive and useful qualities:

he had "a most sweet, good character," he was sympathetic (like Clark) to modernist trends on art, and he had had extensive experience as a war artist and as an advisor to Lord Beaverbrook during the First World War. He had also been a Trustee of the Imperial War Museum since 1920. The IWM had agreed that until peace was restored it would refrain from acquiring artistic records of the Second World War without first offering them to the WAAC. This meant not only that the Museum's art collection would grow slowly during the War, but also that a large percentage of the WAAC's acquisitions would probably eventually be donated to it. Any project to collect war art would therefore need to pay at least passing attention to the advice and ultimate requirements of the IWM.

Percy Jowett was friendly with Clark, and was also familiar with the work of younger artists, thanks to his position as Principal of the Royal College of Art. Similarly, Walter Russell was both the Keeper of the Royal Academy Schools and, according to Clark, "a very mild and liberal minded man." Clark was anxious to placate the potentially obstreperous Royal Academy by having one of its members on the WAAC, and Russell - whose interests in art were more closely aligned with those of Clark than with those of the Academy hierarchy - seemed the ideal choice. As Clark summarised it, "Different interests were seen to have been looked after. That's to say Russell didn't look after the interests of the Royal Academy at all."<sup>24</sup>

Edward Montgomery O'Rourke Dickey was the WAAC's Secretary until 1942, and an ordinary member of the Committee from then until the end of 1945. He was an artist and art teacher in his own right and, coincident with the outbreak of the War, had been seconded to the newly-formed MoI from his job as an art school inspector for the Board of Education.<sup>25</sup> The goals of the War Artists' Advisory Committee were of interest to him; he had in fact formulated them himself, in parallel with Clark.<sup>26</sup> Aside from being an artist, he was also something of an expert in Civil Service procedure and, in the opinion of his colleagues, "a man of vision."<sup>27</sup> All of these qualities endeared him to the artists with whom the Committee dealt, to other civil servants within the MoI, and to Clark (who recalled Dickey as "equable, indefatigable, very kind to me, admirable at the meetings.... He really was first class. Couldn't have done the thing without him.")<sup>28</sup>

As the War progressed the composition of the WAAC changed almost completely. Members resigned and were replaced, and the Ministries of Supply, Production and War Transport later sent representatives.<sup>2</sup> Throughout its history, however, the Committee was dominated and given direction by Clark, who frequently made policy decisions and selected artists without reference to the other members. The latter rarely objected to this practice, deferring instead to Clark's acknowledged expertise. With Bone, Dickey and Russell, he was one of only four indivi-

---

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix 2.

duals to remain an active member of the Committee from the beginning until the end of the War.

The WAAC was to exist for six years, from November 1939 until December 1945. During that time it issued contracts, purchased art, published books and reproductions, and organised exhibitions. The publications and exhibitions are most profitably considered in relation to the issue of war art as propaganda, and discussion of them is therefore deferred to Chapter 4. The remainder of the present chapter is divided into two parts. The first considers in some detail the various considerations involved in the WAAC's selection of artists, and what these indicated about the image of itself that the Committee wished to project. The second traces the history of the deteriorating relationship between the Committee and the Ministry of Information.

#### Operation of the WAAC: Selection of Artists

The process of selecting suitable artists began on 29 November 1939, and continued until 21 February 1940.<sup>29</sup> Of the 755 artists considered by the WAAC during this time, 247 were recommended for employment under one or more of several subject and media categories. Reserve lists gave the names of 141 other artists.<sup>3</sup> The intention of the Committee was not to re-

---

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix 1, part 6.

strict its interest to artists already identified by the war records sections of the Artists and Designers Committee and the Committee on the Employment of Artists in War-time, but rather to examine the work of as many men and women as possible. (The sole exceptions were citizens of enemy states, including refugees who had fled to England before the War.) To ensure that as many candidates as possible were considered, the artist-members of the Committee were asked to submit the names of promising but little-known artists with whose work they were familiar. In addition, the Armed Services representatives were encouraged to take note of artists enlisted in the Army, the Navy and the Air Force.<sup>30</sup> Finally, a radio announcement outlining the aims of the WAAC, and encouraging artists to make their work known to its members, was broadcast on 15 December 1939.

The WAAC gave a small number of artists renewable full-time commissions (usually of six-months duration) with the War Office, the Admiralty, the Air Ministry or the Ministry of Information (and, later in the War, with the Ministry of War Transport). These were the official war artists, of whom there had been thirty-seven by the time the war art project finally ended. Official war artists with the Armed Forces and the Ministry of War Transport were paid with funds requested from the Treasury by the Forces and by the MoWT, but were appointed only with the consent of the Committee as a whole. The official war artists to the Ministry of Information were paid with

funds acquired by the MoI itself for the use of the WAAC. Aside from the official war artists, approximately one hundred other men and women were given contracts to execute pictures, or occasionally sculptures, of specific subjects. Finally, the Committee also purchased art submitted to it on speculation by artists working within Britain or serving with the Armed Forces abroad.<sup>31</sup> By the end of the War approximately 57% of its works had been produced by the official war artists, 13% had been submitted in fulfilment of short-term contracts, 28% had been acquired by purchase, and 2% had been presented as gifts.

The Admiralty's six artists covered the personnel, facilities and activities of the Royal Navy and the Merchant Marine in the waters around Britain, Iceland, the Azores, Sicily and Italy (during the Allied invasion) and (at the end of the War) the Far East. The War Office used its eleven artists to chronicle the Army within Britain. It also sent them to France (before Dunkirk), and to North Africa, Italy, the Middle East, France (for the D-Day invasion), northern Europe and the Far East. The seven Air Ministry artists spent most of their time in Britain, although some work was done in northern Europe after D-Day, and in the Far East in 1945. The fifteen official war artists with the Ministry of Information supplemented the work of the Services' artists in Britain and abroad (principally in northern Europe), as well as working at home on subjects that fell under the jurisdictions of the Minis-

tries of Production, Supply and Home Security. The Ministry of War Transport, the only ministry other than the MoI to employ war artists, had four of them to record its contribution to the war effort within Britain.<sup>4</sup> Over the course of the War three artists were killed while working on a full-time basis for the WAAC: Eric Ravilious (MoI; lost on an operational flight near Iceland in 1942), Albert Richards (War Office; killed by a mine in France in 1945), and Thomas Hennell (Air Ministry; killed by anti-Dutch Indonesian nationalists in Borneo in 1945, apparently after being mistaken for a Dutch citizen).

The official war artists were originally paid at a yearly rate of £650 - a comfortable income at the time, although for an artist like R.G. Eves (who worked for the War Office for six months in 1940) it could be less than he would have received for a single portrait before the War.<sup>32</sup> The official war artists were also eligible for transportation at public expense, free accommodation and meals while working away from home, and applicable travelling and foreign service allowances when they spent time out of the country. In return they were

---

<sup>4</sup> The names of the official war artists, the as well as the Service or government department to which they were attached and the years during which they held their positions, are given in Appendix 1, Part 1. Useful summaries of the travels and work of individual artists are given in Alan Ross, Colours of War: War Art 1939-45 (London: Jonathan Cape, 1983), and in Meirion and Susie Harries, The War Artists: British Official War Art of the Twentieth Century (London: Michael Joseph, in association with the Imperial War Museum and the Tate Gallery, 1983).

required to give the WAAC all the work they produced while on contract, including preparatory studies and sketches. As the War progressed, average income, taxation and the cost of living all rose, biting into the yearly £650 salary with increasing severity. In 1943 the Treasury approved the implementation of a sliding salary scale, with new artists being paid at a rate of £650 per year while more senior artists usually received £750 or £800.<sup>33</sup>

The factors considered by the WAAC in deciding from which artists to acquire works illuminated both the various constraints under which it was required to operate as a body dispensing state funds during a national emergency, and the views of Committee members about their responsibilities to art and artists. The constraints imposed by the War itself, and by the Committee's mandate to record contemporary events, were reflected principally in the choices of media. Only in January 1940, for example, did the members formally agree that their terms of reference did not exclude sculptural records, and by the end of the War a mere twenty-three sculptures had been acquired. One of them was a portrait medallion, and all the others were bronze busts.<sup>5</sup> In part the WAAC blamed this lack of interest in sculpture on the fact that portrait busts required many sittings, whereas the military and civilian

---

<sup>5</sup> The contributing artists were Douglas Bissett, Dora Clarke, Alan Durst, Frank Dobson, C.W. Dyson-Smith, Jacob Epstein, A.H. Gerrard, John Skeaping and Charles Wheeler.



leaders whose status made them particularly "deserving" of having their portraits sculpted often had little time to spare for sittings.<sup>34</sup> (This concern was vindicated when Charles Wheeler became the only sculptor to receive official war artist status. As a result of difficulties in finding celebrities who could afford the time to sit for him, he produced only three busts in fulfilment of his six-month contract with the MoI.) In addition, sculpture more ambitious than portrait busts was considered not only prohibitively expensive for the Committee (which consistently over-ran its budget),<sup>35</sup> but also more appropriate as memorial than as record, and thus outside the WAAC's terms of reference. (In comparison, during the First World War much-publicised bas relief sculpture had been acquired from Charles Sergeant Jagger.) The Committee's terms of reference also resulted in the members refusing to commission any commemorative medals.<sup>36</sup>

The WAAC initially had a much stronger interest in print-making.<sup>37</sup> In 1940 eight lithographs were commissioned from Ethel Gabain, four more from A.S. Hartrick, and two etchings from Hubert Freeth. Six more Gabain lithographs, showing aspects of women's war work, were published in 1941. However, the initial expectations regarding prints were hampered by a variety of factors. A shortage of high-quality paper was a problem. (In May 1944, for example, the Stationery Office was given authorisation to release paper for prints to be made by Frank Beresford, British War Correspondent to the U.S. Army

Air Force in England, only after the issue of "furthering Anglo-American friendship" by means of Beresford's art had been raised in the House of Commons and had been supported by the U.S. Army Chief Quartermaster.<sup>38</sup>) Treasury restrictions (1940) on luxury printing by the Stationery Office probably also contributed to the WAAC's decision to curb its interest in prints, as did the fact that the cost of publishing a series of prints exceeded the prices that the Committee paid for large paintings by all but a few of the artists to whom it issued contracts.<sup>39</sup> (The Curwen Press estimated in August 1940 that to print a small edition of eight lithographs would cost £60,<sup>40</sup> and this was at a time when the WAAC was beginning to reorient its limited acquisitions budget away from small, uncoloured pictures, to include more large, expensive paintings.) Further, the WAAC seems to have originally anticipated that it would commission "a fair number" of lithographs on the assumption that these would be a source of retail profit.<sup>41</sup> However, when the Gabain, Hartrick and Freeth prints were put on sale at the National Gallery during the autumn of 1940, at a cost of five shillings apiece, none proved very popular, despite an advertising display explaining that prints had value as collectables because they were original works of art.<sup>42</sup> As a result of these various factors - most of them resulting from war conditions and from the restrictions imposed by the WAAC's budget - printmakers had little claim on the Committee's attention after 1941. Even in 1940 the WAAC declined to

published a series of lithographs of submarine scenes by Eric Ravillious (based his experiences as an official war artist), although it did ultimately purchase the drawings upon which the lithographs had been based.<sup>43</sup>

The WAAC's choices of artists was also affected by the uneasy balance that the Committee struck between compiling as comprehensive a record of the War as possible, and acquiring paintings, drawings, prints and sculptures that could be expected to maintain their status as important works of art in the post-war world. The latter consideration derived from Clark's concern to use the war art collection to improve public taste (see Chapters 2 and 6), as well as from the Committee's belief that war art would make its greatest contribution to the maintenance of morale and the encouragement of pro-British sentiment if it was distanced in appearance from blatant propaganda (see Chapter 4).

The Committee therefore stressed the importance of each artist's anticipated ability to "make something" of the subjects to which he or she would be exposed. The ability to work quickly under difficult conditions was not necessarily taken into account, even for official war artists sent abroad. The War Office, for example, employed quick-sketch artists like Edward Bawden and Anthony Gross, but it also made an official war artist of William Coldstream, a notoriously slow worker who produced only nine pictures in fulfilment of his 1943

contract.

Similarly, the WAAC did not consider an artist's financial need to be a factor when purchasing or commissioning art, and criticised the organisers of the Recording Britain project for using this as a criterion in their selection of artists. The Committee argued that giving contracts and making purchases on the basis of financial need rather than artistic quality risked lessening the overall aesthetic interest of any art collection.<sup>44</sup> David Bomberg was one example of an artist who fell afoul of this ruling. Desperate for money, he repeatedly begged the Committee for work, but was given only one, small, contract because no one on the WAAC was convinced that his art was of much innate interest.<sup>45</sup>

Analogously, the WAAC expected to pay more for work by artists of recognised ability, than it did for work by their lesser-known counterparts. Paul Nash, for example, received £200 for his painting Battle of Britain, Stanley Spencer and Wyndham Lewis were each paid £300 for Bending the Keel Plate and War Factory in Canada, respectively, and Laura Knight's The Nuremberg Trial cost £500.<sup>46</sup> These were large sums for an organisation that, in its most prosperous times, had a maximum of £10,750 per year to spend on purchases and commissions. In addition, several contracts were given to painters and sculptors who, like Leslie Cole and William Dring, were already employed full-time or who (like R.G. Eves, Laura Knight and Duncan Grant), were financially comfortable. Few of the

thirty-seven official war artists were in difficult financial straits when they received their contracts, and most of the more than one hundred short-term contracts were issued to artists who, though they welcomed the fees involved, were not in urgent need of them. Further, (and despite the WAAC's reiterated determination to patronise artists who were just beginning their professional careers), artists who received official war artist and short-term contracts tended to have substantial experience. This fact was reflected in their ages. The average age of the official war artists when they began their contracts was 42 years, while that of the 123 artists who were given short-term contracts was 49 years.<sup>6</sup>

Another factor affecting the WAAC's choice of artists was the fact that the Committee represented an important experiment in state patronage, and one that Clark hoped would establish a model for continued state involvement in the arts in post-war Britain. Hostile artists and critics, like C.R.W. Nevinson, were keeping a close eye of the Committee to ensure that it did not become a vehicle for the promotion of Clark's favourite artists. The WAAC therefore needed to be seen to be as broad-minded as possible in the acquisition of works in a variety of styles. The latter consideration probably also owed something to the Committee's attempt to maximise the propagan-

---

<sup>6</sup> Artists who held contracts are listed in Appendix 1, Part 2. Artists' dates of birth are also noted in Appendix 1.

da value of the war art collection by implying that, unlike the attitude of the German state towards art and patronage, the British state valued free expression and cultural diversity.<sup>7</sup>

Short-term contracts and official war artist commissions were therefore awarded to artists as diverse as the Royal Academicians W.T. Monnington and R.G. Eves (illustration 3), illustrators like Edward Ardizzone and Feliks Topolski (illustration 12), and Neo-Romantics (Graham Sutherland, John Piper, Henry Moore) (illustration 7). Those who objected to Moore's pictures of Tube shelterers had the alternative of admiring the heightened realism of Meredith Frampton's group portrait of the Senior Regional Commissioners for London. Muirhead Bone's exhaustively detailed drawings (illustration 6) shared space in the collection with surrealist pictures of airplanes and bombed houses by John Armstrong, histrionic battle paintings by Frank Wootton (illustration 17), and introspective works by Keith Vaughan. The WAAC's concern with acquiring works in a variety of styles was exemplified in its 1942 response to Sir James Lithgow (the Director of Merchant Shipbuilding), who complained about the lack of a "factual record of merchant shipbuilding on the Clyde or elsewhere." The Committee had already paid several hundred pounds for nearly half of the fourteen oil paintings in Stanley Spencer's Shipbuilding on the Clyde series (illustration 10). Lithgow,

---

<sup>7</sup> See Chapter 4.

however, did not equate "factual records" with Spencer's art, and the WAAC accordingly commissioned a more conservative academic artist, Henry Rushbury, to execute three shipbuilding drawings.<sup>47</sup>

Thus in 1942 Clark felt justified in praising the WAAC for accumulating "[what] comes very near to being a cross-section of modern English painting." He noted, however, that the collection was without "those pure painters who are interested solely in putting down their feelings about shapes and colours, and not in facts, drama, human emotions and life generally." He cited Matthew Smith, Frances Hodgkins, Ethel Walker, Ivon Hitchens, Ben Nicholson and Victor Pasmore as examples.<sup>48</sup> The Committee's avoidance of abstract and non-objective art was probably inevitable, given the WAAC's mandate to compile an historical record; but it was also supported by Clark's impatience with art that had little or no narrative content. In 1939, for example (referring to the unsettled state of British and European society over the previous decade), he wrote, "... We have seen a series of events so tragic and horrible that our indignation can hardly fail to overflow and swamp our detached contemplation of shapes and colours. To be a pure painter seems almost immoral."<sup>49</sup>

The WAAC's omission of abstract and non-objective art was supported by such art critics as Eric Newton, who alternately praised the literariness of British art and belittled the likelihood that French artists (with their presumed fascina-

tion for "purely aesthetic problems") could focus their attention on social reality long enough to produce anything resembling war art.<sup>50</sup> Maurice Collis, one of the very few critics took exception to assertions of this type, regretted the exclusion from the ranks of the war artists of such figures as John Tunnard (whose paintings, "though non-representational, are very deep and curious records of the war, the shapes they employ and the atmosphere they emit being cognate with it"), and Ben Nicholson (who could, "without departing from his extreme non-representativeness, have recorded aspects or qualities of the war unseen by others and of interest and value").<sup>51</sup> Herbert Read maintained a similar stance, implying that - had Picasso submitted Guernica to the WAAC - it would have been rejected.<sup>52</sup>

There was an implicit contradiction between the WAAC's rejection of international modernism, and its presumed wish to present its acquisitions policies as being reflective of British society's sympathy for freedom of expression. The art of William Nicholson, Barbara Hepworth, Naum Gabo and others was not escapist in intention, as Clark himself often tended to imply that it was. Rather, Nicholson and others viewed artists as central agents of social change leading towards total liberation; as Nicholson complained in 1941, "I have not yet seen it pointed out that [...the] liberation of form and colour is closely linked with all other liberations one hears about. I think it ought, perhaps, to come into one of our lists of war-



aims."<sup>53</sup> This, however, was not a position which evoked much public comprehension or enthusiasm, and the WAAC did not become embroiled in a public relations battle over it.

The exclusion of the international modernists did not mean that contemporary styles per se were deemed incompatible with the national war art collection. Neo-Romanticism combined the merit of being about the War in an obvious, narrative sense, with the advantage - at a time when "Britishness" was a central topic of analysis - of being a style that was usually described as a uniquely British approach to art. In addition, "moderate" modernism was often seen as being an appropriate stylistic vein for contemporary war art, just as the mechanistic character of the First World War seemed to have been most appropriately expressed in the Vorticists' conflation of style and subject. "This war," wrote Jan Gordon in 1943, "has made people feel vividly the limitations of the academic school. They have begun to realise that to express things of such a nature extraordinary methods are not only permissible [sic] but essential."<sup>54</sup>

Yet modernists of all stripes were far from dominating the WAAC's final collection. The Armed Services representatives on the Committee tended to place more importance, than did Clark and the artist-members, upon objective accuracy and/or high drama. The best-documented conflicts on this score were those that arose between Clark and Harald Peake, the WAAC's Air Ministry representative from 1940 until 1942. Peake

refused to re-engage either of his first two official war artists (Keith Henderson and Paul Nash) after the expiration of their initial contracts in 1940. Henderson's An Improvised Test of an Under-carriage angered Peake because the figure doing the testing was jumping up and down on the airplane's wing, in clear violation of regulations. Paul Nash, under the impression that his work "would be expected to give an imaginative interpretation of the subject [...whereas] other artists ... would attend to the factual and documentary records,"<sup>55</sup> produced a series of watercolours (Aerial Creatures; submitted in September 1940) that exemplified his intrigue with the concept of anthropomorphism in Nature. The series consisted of interpretive "portraits" of Blenheims, Hampdens, Wellingtons and other types of British aircraft, each given a distinct "personality" based on Nash's impressions. "I did not trouble," he wrote, "to learn their [the airplanes'] names, and to follow their actual anatomy was often beyond me."<sup>56</sup> This was a red flag to Peake, as was Nash's assertion that the aircraft themselves were much more important in the War than were the humans who flew them.<sup>57</sup> The Aerial Creatures, and subsequent works such as Target Area: Whitley Bombers Over Berlin (illustration 19), impressed everyone on the WAAC except Peake, who in October 1940 insisted that, "although the work this artist had done had been much admired for its artistic merits it was not so well thought of from the Service point of view...."<sup>58</sup> Clark, an ardent admirer of Nash's work,

wrote to the artist:

We have told them [the Air Ministry] how foolish they are in very strong - I might almost say insulting - terms, but I am afraid there are a number of them led by Peake who yearn for the Royal Academy style, and they are determined to have it.<sup>59</sup>

The Air Ministry representatives further frustrated Clark and the WAAC's artist-members by insisting upon purchasing and commissioning what they (Clark et al) argued was appallingly bad work from artists such as Frank Beresford (two eulogistic and saccharine posthumous portraits of Victoria Cross winners), Oswald Birley, and Frank Wootton.<sup>60</sup>

In order to avoid criticisms that it was obsessed with English artists, the War Artists' Advisory Committee made an effort to purchase and commission work from artists throughout the country, and from those in Scotland in particular. The members had not originally intended to take an artist's place of residence into consideration when buying or commissioning work (probably in an attempt to avoid being forced to acquire art in which they were not interested); but this policy was changed when the Royal Scottish Society of Painters in Water-Colours, and especially the Royal Scottish Academy, mounted a campaign (in 1940) against what they claimed was geographical bias on the part of the WAAC.<sup>61</sup> The Committee responded by soliciting suggestions for artists from David Foggie (Secre-

tary of the Royal Scottish Academy), Hubert Wellington (Principal of the Edinburgh College of Art) and William Oliphant Hutchison (Principal of the Glasgow School of Art). Seven of the forty-nine artists thus brought to the Committee's attention were recommended for employment, and four more were put on a reserve list.<sup>8</sup> (Analogously, in January 1940 E.M.O'R. Dickey corresponded with R.V. Williams in Belfast, obtaining a list of Northern Irish artists whom Williams considered outstanding.<sup>9</sup>) Even before the names of the Scottish artists had been sent to London, contracts had been given to the Scots James Grant and A.S. Hartrick. Muirhead Bone had been an official war artist with the Admiralty for several weeks, and Keith Henderson was about to be appointed to the same position with the Air Ministry. James Cowie, H.A. Crawford and Robert Sivell were all subsequently assigned to paint the portraits of noteworthy Scottish civilians. James Miller was commissioned to record bomb damage and other subjects in Scotland, and several drawings of an Army unit consisting almost entirely of Scots were acquired from Ian Eadie.

Yet this geographical diversity did not necessarily indicate that the WAAC was as democratic in its practices as it liked to imply. The Scottish artists (with the noteworthy exception of Muirhead Bone, as official war artist to the Admiralty) were usually assigned to record Scottish subjects-

---

<sup>8</sup> See Appendix 1, Part 6.

<sup>9</sup> See Appendix 1, Part 6.

a practice that pleased the art organisations to which they belonged, but also one that was somewhat parochial. To an appreciable extent this matching of artists to subjects may be defended on the grounds that most Scottish artists were singularly well-placed to record Scottish subjects, but such a defence ignores the fact that the WAAC also spent large sums to send other artists on journeys far from their homes to record specific subjects. Stanley Spencer, for example, was sent by the Committee from Cookham to Scotland to produce his series of shipbuilding paintings. This entailed hefty expenses for travel and daily allowances, all of which the Committee willingly paid.

However, even if one accepted the argument that artists resident in Scotland should be assigned primarily to record Scottish subjects, this raised questions of a similar nature regarding women artists, and their treatment by the WAAC. Most of the women who held war art contracts were assigned to record aspects of "women's work." Dorothy Coke, Ethel Gibbs and Evelyn Dunbar were asked to supply pictures of Women's Voluntary Services activities, Dunbar and Frances Macdonald executed paintings of nursing subjects, Ethel Gabain made lithographs showing evacuation operations and crèches, and Laura Knight painted work performed by WAAFs and by a noted female factory employee (illustrations 9,11). Such subjects, along with a few portraits (usually of female sitters) constituted almost the entire output of women artists in fulfilment of

WAAC contracts. It is also significant that, of the 123 artists given short-term contracts by the Committee, only thirteen were women.<sup>10</sup> Only one official war artist contract was ever held by a woman: Evelyn Dunbar, who worked under the auspices of the Ministry of Information, recording women's work in Britain. Colin Coote informed the other Committee members (in December 1939) that women could not be made official war artists with the War Office because "women journalists [for administrative purposes war artists were originally classed with war correspondents] can only be allowed to proceed as far as L. of C. (lines of communication). If women artists were to be allowed to proceed further, it would cause impossible jealousy."<sup>62</sup> Even after the collapse of Germany, only Mary Kessell was sent abroad, at her own request, and not as an official war artist.

Thus, although the WAAC was seen to be promoting the work of little-known artists, of women, and of artists from several parts of Britain, its selection of them was somewhat more circumscribed than it implied. In addition to the points noted above, it should be observed that only one of the six Ulster artists recommended to the WAAC in 1940 (William Conor) eventually contributed work to the war art collection. There was perhaps a degree of correlation between this and the fact that artists' organisations in Northern Ireland - unlike their Scottish counterparts - never complained about the Committee's

---

<sup>10</sup> See Appendix 1, Part 2.

choices of artists. Neither did Welsh artists' organisations, and the Committee does not seem to have made any attempts to contact institutions such as the Royal Cambrian Academy to solicit suggestions. Abstract and non-objective painters and sculptors, as well as all refugee artists, were ignored, while other groups were usually associated with restricted ranges of appropriate subjects.

However, despite these discrepancies, the Committee established and maintained a reputation for showing few if any blind spots. Upholders of conservative tastes sometimes objected that Clark and his colleagues were wasting funds on inferior artists while neglecting those whose work was more worthy of consideration. The Editor of The Connoisseur, for example, protested in 1941 that "the arbitrary selection of certain fortunate and fashionable men [by the WAAC] has had ridiculous results."<sup>63</sup> F.C. Tilney, one of the Committee's most bitter opponents, raged in 1941 that its support of modernist artists "is on the lines of Nazi propaganda, the aim of which is to stifle instinctive judgement and to control individual thought and opinion."<sup>64</sup> In general, however, the acquisition, by the WAAC, of a broad range of contemporary British artists forestalled such criticisms (and, indeed, convinced reviewers that its intentions were diametrically opposed to the intolerance of Nazism).

The final factor that had an important influence upon the

WAAC's selection of artists was whether or not the artist in question was a member of the Armed Forces. The First World War paintings that Clark and other Committee members valued the most tended to be those done by men who had been directly exposed to life on the Front as part of their military duties (e.g., Paul Nash, C.R.W. Nevinson, Wyndham Lewis and Stanley Spencer). In addition the WAAC, given both its mandate to record the War and the limited numbers of official war artists it had working abroad, relied heavily upon obtaining work by Forces personnel, and this need became greater as the War grew in geographical scope. If an artist in the Armed Forces complained of being denied facilities or permission to sketch, the Committee reviewed the quality of his or her art. If it was judged to be sufficiently good, the War Office, Admiralty or Air Ministry representative wrote to the commanding officer to request that the artist be given opportunities to draw, paint or sculpt, insofar as such opportunities did not interfere with his or her regular duties.<sup>65</sup>

In the cases of serving artists with whom the WAAC was sufficiently impressed to wish to issue them with short-term contracts, it was necessary to apply to have the artists temporarily excused from their regular duties; but this was a practice that the Committee's Armed Services representatives were reluctant to encourage.<sup>66</sup> Only about fifty-five paintings and drawings were ultimately produced by Armed Services personnel - all of whom were male - in fulfilment of short-term



contracts.<sup>11</sup> Removing individuals entirely from the Armed Forces in order to make them official war artists proved even more difficult.<sup>67</sup> Of the thirty-one men who held such commissions with one or more of the Armed Services only six (Edward Ardizzone, William Coldstream, James Morris, Albert Richards, Carel Weight and John Worsley) actually had experience as enlisted personnel before assuming their positions.

However, some 778 works (i.e., only about 13% of all the items acquired by the WAAC, but roughly half of all of its purchases) were bought from 138 artists serving in the three Armed Services. (Only two of these artists were women: Joy Collier, a WAAF Section Officer, and Stella Schmolle, a Sergeant in the ATS.) The comparatively large numbers of purchases that were made from Armed Forces personnel (many of them little-known as artists) was perhaps the strongest argument in favour of the notion of the WAAC as a body concerned to acquire art from as broad a cross-section of the British population as possible. The Committee occasionally muttered about the lack of formal interest in these artworks, but continued to purchase them nonetheless, if only to avoid charges that it was neglecting the efforts of soldiers, sailors and airmen who were serving overseas.

The task of selecting artists to participate in a state-financed collection of war art thus entailed the coordination

---

<sup>11</sup> See Appendix 1, Part 2.

of a variety of criteria determined by the exigencies of the War itself, but more often reflecting the WAAC's concern with appearing to be as broad-minded as possible, and with building an art collection that would be of lasting aesthetic as well as historical interest. The appearance of broad-mindedness and the emphasis on aesthetic quality were important because they implied that, even in wartime, British society remained open to diversity - a valuable propaganda ploy (discussed at length in Chapter 4) that had much in common with the British Council's promotion of "cultural propaganda." In the longer term, broad-mindedness and aesthetic quality could be used to prove that state sponsorship of art was not necessarily to be equated with any form of "official art," and the works acquired by the WAAC could therefore be used to justify the post-war continuation of state patronage. However, as will be seen in the next section, these considerations, along with the artworks acquired by the WAAC, were not always appreciated by the Ministry of Information. The WAAC's installation within the MoI had, from the beginning, been problematic, and relations became more severely strained the longer the War lasted.

#### Committee and Ministry

The WAAC was fortunate insofar as some of its staunchest supporters were also some of the most powerful members of the MoI. Aside from Harold Macmillan they included Brendan Bracken

and, for a time, Cyril Radcliffe (respectively, the Minister of Information and the Director-General of the MoI from 1941 until the end of the War). However, other officials were less indulgent, and the position of the Committee was not a secure one. In a Ministry living under sustained public criticism and operating on a tight budget, the WAAC seemed, to many, a logical candidate for administrative pruning.

This impression was strengthened when, in 1942, the administrative grouping that linked the WAAC, the Exhibitions Division and the Studio Division within the Ministry's larger Displays, Exhibitions and Official Artists Division was re-evaluated.<sup>68</sup> Officials were reluctant to encourage the existence of small groups outside the control of specific internal sections of the MoI, and the WAAC had more in common with Exhibitions and Studio than with any other branches of the Ministry; but the Director of Displays, Exhibitions and Official Artists had little interest in the Committee. His indifference contributed, during the first half of 1942, to the striking of a compromise that maintained the WAAC as part of his Division but that permitted independent contact between the Committee's Secretary and the MoI Establishments Division. This allowed the WAAC to negotiate finance and policy directly with the central finance organ of the Ministry, and thus made the WAAC an operationally independent unit within the MoI. In April of 1942 this unofficial status was given Treasury sanction, and the WAAC became formally distinct from the Exhibitions and

Studio Divisions<sup>69</sup> - a structural change that was interpreted by some as confirmation that the Committee had only a tangential link with the aims and goals of the MoI. It had become a de facto independent body in terms of staffing, finance and general policy formulation, while still being funded entirely through the Ministry.<sup>70</sup> This raised the possibility of a future severing of relations between the MoI and the WAAC.

The catalyst of that severing of relations was a staffing change within the WAAC itself. In July 1942 E.M.O'R. Dickey concluded almost three years as the Committee's Secretary, and returned to his pre-war work with the Board of Education. His first successor was Arnold Palmer, who had earlier been employed by the Department of Fine Art of the Carnegie Institute, and as Secretary of the Recording Britain project. Palmer was replaced two months later by E. Elmslie Owen, a former staff member of the Westminster School of Art. Complaints were soon being received about the new Secretary.<sup>71</sup> The exact nature of the problems that led to these complaints are unclear, but the Principal Establishments Officer of the MoI assumed that they were rooted in the independent status won for the WAAC in 1942. This status had made it difficult for Elmslie Owen to find anyone within the MoI who took much interest in the war art project. Lacking Dickey's grasp of the niceties of Civil Service procedure and etiquette, Elmslie Owen had evidently begun to create antagonisms.

Whatever the complaints about Elmslie Owen may have been,

they were raised at an inopportune time. The Ministry of Information's administrators and financial planners included several individuals who were becoming increasingly resentful about being in the unconventional position of being expected to defend the actions of the Committee to both the Treasury and Parliament, without having any input into its policy formulation. There was also growing dissatisfaction within the Ministry over what was described as the utter failure of the war art to be useful as effective propaganda. The latter complaint had grown in intensity throughout 1941 and 1942, and was to reach a peak in a 1943 internal memorandum to the Deputy Director-General:

[...General Production Division] have never used a reproduction of any work by War Artists and ... the booklets produced by Publications [Division], when exported to Sweden, gave the Germans an opportunity ... to represent that the British could not produce photographs of non-existent victories and therefore employed artists to draw fancy pictures. The only real use to which War Artists' work was put by the Ministry ... was the reproduction of portraits by Eric Kennington and others of personalities who do not photograph well. .... As for other uses, they did put one or two landscapes by War Artists into the book on the Abyssinian Campaign, but ... photographs are much more usefull [sic] than drawings or paintings because they give the impression of authenticity.<sup>72</sup>

In these circumstances it was probably inevitable that the idea would sooner or later be floated of excising the WAAC from the MoI altogether. The Elmslie Owen episode was only a

catalyst. In January 1943 Ministry and Treasury officials agreed that:

The War artists are recorders, not propagandists. As such, their work seems to fall ... outside the Ministry altogether. This has always been recognised so far as the written history of the war is concerned, and we successfully resisted an attempt by the War Cabinet Offices to saddle us with responsibility for a film record of the war. Why should pictures be a different case?<sup>73</sup>

Also in January 1943, three options were proposed for amending the status of the WAAC ("this little incubus," as the Deputy Director-General called it).<sup>74</sup> One gave overall authority for the Committee to the National Gallery but kept the responsibility for employing and commissioning artists with the individual Service Departments. The other two made the Service Departments entirely responsible for commissioning and paying artists working on short-term contracts as well as their own official war artists. This was to be done either by reducing the WAAC to a purely advisory body, or by abolishing it outright. However, the National Gallery was unwilling to provide funding to administer the war art project and was not sanguine about the likelihood of obtaining a Supplementary Estimate for the purpose, while the Service Departments were reluctant to assume the administrative duties that would devolve upon them if the WAAC was humbled or dissolved. MoI administrators therefore concluded that if a war art project was to exist it

would probably involve the continued functioning of the WAAC within the Ministry - a controversial decision at a time when Ministry staffing costs were coming under increasingly close scrutiny.<sup>75</sup> As a partial solution the WAAC was placed firmly under the control of F.H. Dowden, a Regional Administrator in the MoI's Home Division.<sup>76</sup> Dowden assumed responsibility for controlling almost all WAAC activities, including budgeting, but with the significant exception of "aesthetic policy."<sup>77</sup>

Such a balance of responsibilities got off to a rocky beginning, with Dowden refusing to support either the WAAC's decision to pay the studio rent of official war artist Henry Lamb, or its arrangements for making advance payments to Wyndham Lewis for a large painting for which the artist had received a contract.<sup>78</sup> Battles over aesthetic policy were even more tenaciously fought. Dowden contended that he was justified in vetoing Committee decisions about proposed subjects that seemed to him unimportant as war records. "There is too much repetition [in the WAAC collection] of subjects which are historically unimportant," Dowden complained, "and it may quite well be that the Committee are more concerned with finding work for artists in whom they are interested, than they are about making a record of the progress of the war."<sup>79</sup> The WAAC's decision to send Edward Bawden to Iran and/or Iraq earned Home Office agreement only with difficulty, while a plan to give Stephen Bone an open contract to record subjects of his own choosing was rejected as an irresponsible use of

public funds.

To prevent such problems from arising in the future, Dowden arranged (in mid-1943) for MoI employee R.H. Parker to sit on the Committee. He also won Committee and Treasury agreement that all WAAC contracts must specify the subjects commissioned and the number of works expected, and that the Committee must not make commitments to artists before those commitments had been approved by the Ministry.<sup>80</sup> The MoI also admitted, however, that Dowden may have overstepped a reasonable line of demarcation of responsibilities, and that any committee of experts in a particular subject should be given a fairly loose rein.<sup>81</sup>

Yet these stop-gap measures did not address the deep-seated problems inherent in the administrative relationship between the Committee and the Ministry. The option of vesting central coordination of the WAAC with the National Gallery was therefore reconsidered. This time the MoI agreed to maintain the Committee on its Parliamentary Vote while simultaneously allowing it to be removed entirely from Home Division authority. This removed the Gallery's previous apprehensions about being required to fund the Committee. After some eighteen months of experiments and disputes, the move of the WAAC to the National Gallery finally occurred smoothly, on 5 July 1943. That same day Elmslie Owen, whose shortcomings had in part precipitated the entire affair, was replaced by the WAAC's final Secretary, Eric Craven (Peter) Gregory, an ardent



supporter and benefactor of British artists.<sup>82</sup>

Why did the MoI persist in exploring and re-exploring its limited range of options for restructuring its formal relations with the WAAC? The decision to remove the Committee from the Ministry itself to the National Gallery, while continuing to fund it on the MoI's Parliamentary Vote, was cosmetic in nature; the only action that would have addressed the incongruity of the Ministry-Committee relationship would have been the abolition of the WAAC altogether. This, however, was a step that the Minister of Information (Brendan Bracken) was not prepared to sanction. Aside from his personal interest in art, he recognised that some pieces of government-commissioned First World War art were reckoned among the most important examples of twentieth-century British painting. In addition, his marked success as Minister of Information derived from a sophisticated and flexible approach to propaganda. He was certainly aware of, and probably shared, Kenneth Clark's belief (discussed at greater length in Chapter 4) that fine art could act as propaganda not by stimulating base instincts of patriotism or hatred, but rather by appealing as a symbol. By 1943 the promotion of cultural pursuits had almost become something of a national war objective. This claim had frequently been made by Clark, Eric Newton, Jan Gordon and others, always accompanied by denigration of the form that association between the state and the fine arts had taken in Germany. Having given the WAAC a home at the beginning of the

War, the MoI thus found itself by 1943 unable to sever those ties without effectively killing the Committee and everything for which it had come to stand. Under these circumstances a cosmetic solution was the best that could be achieved.

The deteriorating relationship between the WAAC and the MoI can effectively be charted by tracing the history of the Treasury funding requested by the MoI, for the WAAC, between 1939 and 1945. For its 1939-1940 fiscal year the Committee received £5000 (independent of the funds expended by the Admiralty, the War Office and the Air Ministry on the salaries of their official war artists) for purchasing and commissioning art. The 1940-1941 grant was endangered by the Treasury itself which, after Dunkirk, pressed for the dismissal of the War Office's official artists, and later expressed strong doubt "that the production for posterity of an artistic record of England at war is either essential for the effective prosecution of the war or a proper function of a purely war-time Department [the MoI]."<sup>83</sup> Even at this early date Clark countered by asserting not only that the propaganda value of the war art collection related directly to the war effort, but also that - even if art was not needed to help attain victory - a refusal to support the WAAC would be equivalent to a renunciation of the civilising values that Britain had ostensibly entered the War to defend.<sup>84</sup> (Lord Beaverbrook, whose British War Memorials Committee had foreshadowed the

WAAC in many respects, had been forced to contend with similar complaints from the Treasury during the First World War. Like Clark, he had made in response rather vague general comments about the usefulness of his war art as propaganda.)

Clark was supported, in 1940, both by Colonel Scorgie (an efficiency expert at the MoI) and Frank Pick (the Director-General of the Ministry during the last four months of 1940). Scorgie argued that the WAAC "has not got us into any serious trouble; [and] we have no other possible machinery for doing [...its] work." Pick (who had already made several suggestions to the WAAC, regarding artists and subjects), rejected the Treasury's arguments about the separation between culture and propaganda: "They are properly related," he urged, "if propaganda is good."<sup>85</sup> As a result, an increased grant of £8000 was made to the Ministry for 1940-1941, of which £6500 was intended to be used to purchase and commission art.

By 1942, however, it was becoming clear that many officials within the MoI were losing all patience with the WAAC's work. In its annual funding application that year the Committee therefore broke with its previous practice by asking for exactly the same sum it had received in 1941-1942: £10,000 for unassigned commissions and purchases, £500 for portraits of Admiralty personnel (neither of the Admiralty's official war artists being a portraitist),<sup>86</sup> and £3500 for expenses. Again Treasury officials agreed to the full amount only after raising objections to the very existence of the WAAC.

With the Committee's move to the National Gallery in July 1943, Cyril Radcliffe (the Ministry's Director-General at the time) indicated his unwillingness to continue funding the Committee. "I myself have the strongest doubts as to the value of the great part of this activity," he wrote. "I think that far too many pictures are painted for far too little purpose and too many of them are ineffective coloured photographs."<sup>87</sup> The Ministry decided that funding could only be continued on the MoI's Vote until 1 April 1944, at which time the Committee would be left either to find its own source<sup>S</sup>(2) of income or to perish. £8000 was approved for the period from September to April, calculated on the basis of the values of the 1942-1943 grant (for supplies and miscellaneous costs, as well as for purchases and commissions), spread over seven rather than twelve months.

This step would, if carried through, have effectively put an end to the anomalous position in which the MoI found itself as a result of its 1943 agreement to fund the WAAC even though the latter functioned almost entirely without reference to the Ministry's wishes. As noted, however, Brendan Bracken continued to be sympathetic to the goals of the Committee, even after its physical relocation from Senate House to the National Gallery. When Clark objected to losing MoI funding, Bracken suggested that the WAAC be made the personal responsibility of himself as Minister of Information. (This was an arrangement that had been employed for similar purposes in other mini-

stries.) Clark pursued these negotiations with Bracken on the by-now disingenuous theory that "to break away from the Ministry and set up new machinery would mean a great deal of work and worry for everyone involved ... and I cannot see what would be gained by it."<sup>88</sup> After much internal discussion officials at the MoI relented, and recommended to the Treasury in 1944 that the WAAC probably served a useful purpose, though not one that merited yearly grants comparable to those that had been approved since 1941-1942. This bitter pill was made somewhat more palatable at the Ministry by the acknowledgment that, especially in view of the fact that the Armed Service Departments and the Ministry of War Transport continued to pay the salaries of their own official war artists, substantial funding through the MoI itself was not necessary to ensure the continued (though diminished) existence of the WAAC. Ministry and Committee therefore compromised on a reduced yearly grant of £10,750 for 1944-1945, down from the £14,000 that the Committee had received in 1942-1943, and that had been used to calculate its seven-month grant of £8000 for the period 1 September 1943-1 April 1944. This new level of funding entailed a reduction in the number of short-term contracts to be issued by the WAAC, and necessitated the elimination of three Ministry of Information official war artist commissions.

The WAAC continued to be funded through the MoI until the end of 1945, but more out of a combination of inertia and Bracken's intervention than a strong belief that the Committee

was doing work that benefited the MoI. This was confirmed in negotiations over whether, after 1 April 1944, the Ministry should continue to provide certain services to the Committee. The Photographic Division, for example, filed the photographs of every WAAC artwork, distributed them to recipients within and without the Ministry, dealt with requests for reproductions in newspapers, magazines and books, and handled sales of photographs to private individuals. The General Production Division printed and posted war art catalogues, while the Distribution Section of that Division crated and dispatched artworks for exhibition. The Finance Division issued contracts and authorised payments (made through the Division's Accounts Branch), the News Division issued sketching permits, the Overseas Division concerned itself with artists and artworks sent abroad, and the Travel Section of the Communications Division was also involved with artists sent overseas.<sup>89</sup> Gregory pointed out that the costs inherent in supplying reproductions and arranging exhibitions should be borne by the Ministry on the grounds that reproductions and exhibitions were the only aspects of the WAAC's activities that could be construed as propaganda, and that the MoI would be hard-pressed to justify funding the Committee to acquire art at all if it did not also provide the resources to publicise that art.<sup>90</sup> Officials at the MoI conceded the point, but consoled themselves by reflecting that the WAAC had never been active enough in propaganda to make significant demands on Ministry personnel.

Thus, throughout its uneasy alliance with the War Artists' Advisory Committee, the Ministry of Information voiced objections and issued a variety of demands and ultimata, almost all of which it abandoned in the face of objections from Clark and his colleagues. This good will was shown by the Ministry in spite of the belief of many senior employees there that the WAAC was making little or no contribution to propaganda. The extent to which the Committee was in fact a supplier of material for this purpose is the subject of the next chapter.

### Chapter 3: Endnotes

1. Kenneth Clark, "The Artist in Wartime," Listener, 22 #563 (26 October 1939), p.810.

2. State patronage of art in First World War Britain has received its most thorough descriptive and analytical treatment in Susan Malvern, Art, Propaganda and Patronage. An History of the Employment of British War Artists 1916-1919 (Ph.D. thesis, University of Reading, 1981). A less detailed history is given in Meirion and Susie Harries, The War Artists: British Official War Art of the Twentieth Century (London: Michael Joseph, in association with the Imperial War Museum and the Tate Gallery, 1983).

3. Maria Tippet, The History of the Canadian War Memorial Scheme as a Study of Patronage and Visual Record of the Great War (Ph.D. thesis, University College, London, 1982); published as Art at the Service of War: Canada, Art, and the Great War (Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 1984).

4. Kenneth Clark, The Other Half: A Self-Portrait (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1977), p.22.

5. Ibid., p.22; and Clark, "Introduction," New Metropole Art Centre, Memorial Exhibition: The War Artists (Folkestone: New Metropole Art Centre, 1964), n.p.

6. Herbert Read, "Art and War," Spectator (9 February 1940), pp.174-175.

7. Eric Newton, Art for Everybody (London/New York/Toronto: Longmans Green & Co, for the British Council, 1943) (series: Britain Advances, #7), p.15.

8. See Arthur Calder-Marshall, Cyril Connolly et al, "Why Not War Writers? A Manifesto," Horizon, 4 #22 (October 1941), pp.236-239.

9. E.B. Morgan, untitled memorandum ([September?] 1939) (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/10).

10. For example, Clark quoted in anonymous, "War Artists [sic] Advisory Committee," [AIA] Bulletin, #68 (December 1941), [p.1].

11. E.E. Bridges (Offices of the War Cabinet) to Brendan Bracken (Minister of Information), 15 June 1942 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/626).



12. Colonel Scorgie (MoI) to Cyril Radcliffe (Director-General, MoI), 27 September 1940 (GP/46/B); Harries and Harries, The War Artists, op.cit., p.157.

13. B.M. Power (MoI) to Kenneth Clark, 22 September 1939; Minutes of the 27 September 1939 meeting of the Artists and Designers Committee (both, NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

14. A.P. Waterfield to Mr. Claughton (MoI), 27 September 1939 (GP/46/A).

15. Kenneth Clark to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 29 September 1939 (NG Archive: Ministry of Information Artists' Advisory Committee, 1939).

16. See correspondence dated 3-17 September 1939 in GP/46/A; and Raymond Needham (MoI) to Kenneth Clark, 21 September 1939 (NG Archive: Ministry of Information Artists' Advisory Committee, 1939).

17. Bone was formally proposed for the position in R.M.Y. Gleadowe, "An Immediate Policy for the Appointment of an Official Artist for Sea War-fare" (16 October 1939) (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939).

18. Kenneth Clark to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 29 September 1939 (GP/46/A).

19. A.P. Waterfield (Deputy Director-General, MoI) to J.H. Beith, Arthur Street and R.S. Wood, 18 November 1939 (GP/46/A).

20. WAAC, "Ministry of Information. Artists' Advisory Committee. Terms of Reference" (GP/72/A(1), p.2).

21. IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: Lord Clark, OM, CH, KCB, C Lit, FBA (tape-recorded interview), reel #1; p.5 of transcript.

22. Ibid., reel #1; p.7 of transcript.

23. John Hilton to A.P. Waterfield, 17 September 1939 (GP/46/A).

24. IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: Lord Clark, op.cit., reel #1; p.5 of transcript.

25. Dickey had studied at the Westminster School of Art under Harold Gilman, and had exhibited at the Royal Academy, and with the New English Art Club and the London Group. His teaching career had included appointments as Art Master at

2. Oyundle School (1924-1926), Professor Fine Art at King's College, University of Durham (1926-1931), and Professor of Fine Art at King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne (1928-1931).

26. E.M.O'R. Dickey speaking, in Henry Lewes (Director), Artists in Wartime (Omnibus Film, 1971).

27. Harold W. Sanderson, "Art Schools and Art in Industry," Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, 82 (29 December 1933), p.188.

28. IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: Lord Clark (op.cit.), reel #1; p.4 of transcript; Clark, "Foreword," in Alan Ross, The Colours of War: War Art 1939-1945 (London: Jonathan Cape, 1983), p.7; Eric Kennington to E.M.O'R. Dickey, [October 1940]. (GP/55/1(A), p.141); Ethel Gabain to Dickey, 28 June 1943 (GP/55/46).

29. The seven preliminary lists of artists drawn up by the Committee from November 1939 to February 1940 are in GP/72/A(1), pp.37-38, 51, 99-100; and GP/72/A(2), pp.189-190, 209-212, 234-235.

30. WAAC, Minutes of the 26 February 1941 meeting.

31. For a justification of this tripartite system, see Eric Newton, War Through Artists' Eyes: Paintings and Drawings by British War Artists (London: John Murray, 1945), p.7.

32. Harries and Harries, The War Artists, op.cit., p.167. Francis Watson estimated that in a good year during the latter half of the 1930's an "average" artist might have made £180 from sales, and that studio, materials, framing, hanging, model and other fees would total nearly £190 (Art Lies Bleeding (London: Chatto & Windus, 1939), p.34). The average yearly salary for full-time male teachers in 1938 was £425, and that of their female counterparts was £327 (Whitackers Almanac, 1943 (London: Whitackers, [1943]), p.449; Board of Education, Third Report of the Standing Joint Committee on Standard Scales of Salaries for Teachers in Technical and Art Schools (London: HMSO, 1938), pp.11-12). For industrial designers weekly salaries ranged from £3 to £5 or £6, and immediately before the War there were not thought to be more than two or three designers in each type of manufacturing industry who were earning £1000 or more per year. Middle-range commercial artists could expect £500 or more per year, compared to the base figure of £650 for an official war artist. Those who worked in small agencies earned less - as little as £260 per year in some provincial firms, although a layout artist of distinctive ability might have a salary of £1000 yearly (Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts: A Report Sponsored by the Dartington Hall Trustees (London/New York/Toronto: Geof-

frey Cumberlege/Oxford University Press, 1946), pp.63-64; see also James Boswell, The Artist's Dilemma (London; The Bodley Head, 1947), pp.25,33-35).

33. J.A. Barlow (Treasury) to Kenneth Clark, 23 January 1943 (GP/72/G(1), p.138).

34. Minutes of the 18 and 31 July 1940 meetings; E.M.O'R. Dickey to William McMillan, 12 August 1940 (GP/55/64).

35. See correspondence in GP/46/81/1.

36. GP/72/2; Minutes of the 29 August 1940 meeting.

37. E.M.O'R. Dickey to Leigh Ashton (MoI), 16 March 1940 (GP/55/32).

38. Hansard, 399 (3 May 1944), columns 1304-1305; American and British Commonwealth Association, Exhibition of Pictures and Sketches of the U.S. Army Air Force. E.T.O. by Frank E. Beresford (U.S. Army War Correspondent No.1242) (London: published under the auspices of the American and British Commonwealth Association, 1946). (Beresford's prints were neither commissioned nor purchased by the WAAC.) For other examples see the Minutes of the 3 July 1940 meeting; E.M.O'R. Dickey to Ethel Gabain, 4 July 1940 (GP/55/46); and 1941 correspondence between the WAAC and Phyllis Ginger (GP/55/156).

39. R.A. Bevan (General Production Division, MoI) to Kenneth Clark, 19 May 1940 (GP/46/10); GP/55/156.

40. Minutes of the 29 August 1940 meeting.

41. E.M.O'R. Dickey to C.F.S. Plumbly (HMSO), 16 March 1940 (GP/55/32).

42. Minutes of the 12 February 1940 meeting; GP/46/10/2.

43. WAAC, Minutes of the 29 August and 18 December 1940, and the 12 and 26 March 1941 meetings.

44. WAAC, "Interim Report for the Second Year of the War" (August 1941), p.2 (GP/46/B).

45. WAAC draft letter to Bomberg, February 1942 (GP/72/F, p.86).

46. Even these represented small payments in comparison to the artists' pre-war expectations. Laura Knight was paid 75 guineas for her oil painting Ruby Loftus Screwing a Breech Nut (illustration 9), and would have expected to be paid about 400

guineas in 1939 for a comparably large canvas (Minutes of the 7 February 1940 meeting; see also Edmond Kapp to E.M.O'R. Dickey, [January 1941] (GP/55/91); and Dickey, memorandum (15 December 1939) (GP/55/3).

47. Minutes of the 30 December 1942 meeting.

48. Kenneth Clark, "War Artists at the National Gallery," Studio, 123 #586 (January 1942), pp.2-3.

49. Kenneth Clark, "Preface," in Roger Fry, Last Lectures (Clark, ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939), p.vi.

50. Eric Newton, "Paul Nash," Weekend Review (19 October 1951), p.138.

51. Maurice Collis, "Art," Observer, 21 October 1945, p.2.

52. Herbert Read, "War and Art," Spectator (9 February 1940), p.17.

53. Ben Nicholson, "Notes on Abstract Art," Horizon, 4 #22 (October 1941), p.272.

54. Jan Gordon, handwritten notes for a talk, "The Artist and the War of 1914-18," delivered on 28 February 1943 as part of a series of six lectures on "The Artist and the War" at the National Gallery, under the auspices of the Artists' International Association (Tate: AIA papers, 7043.2. 3.30).

55. Paul Nash, "The Personality of Planes," Vogue (March 1942), pp.42-43,76; reprinted in Paul Nash, Outline: An Autobiography, and Other Writings (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1949), p.249.

56. Nash, Outline, op.cit., p.249; see also in (Outline) his essay "Bomber's Lair," pp.254-257.

57. Nash, "The Personality of Planes," op.cit., pp.42-43,76; see also Margot Eates, Paul Nash (London: John Murray, 1973), p.73. As observed in Chapter 5, the Air Ministry put a great deal of emphasis upon the acquisition of portraits of members of the RAF.

58. Minutes of the 10 October 1941 meeting.

59. Kenneth Clark to Paul Nash, October 1940 (GP/72/13(1)).

60. Minutes of the 2 July 1941 meeting; [Kenneth Clark] to Harald Peake, 5 August 1941, and E.M.O'R. Dickey to Clark, 6 August 1941 (GP/72/E(2), pp.180-182. The reluctance of the Committee to purchase more than one picture from Wootton, and his resentment at what he saw as a flagrant disregard of visual accuracy on the part of the WAAC, is made clear in the correspondence contained in GP/55/397.

61. Hansard, 361 (28 May 1940), columns 429-430; GP/46/9; MoHS (in PRO): HO 186/2235; E.M.O'R. Dickey, "Scottish Artists" (7 May 1940; GP/72/C(2), p.129); [Dickey] to Kenneth Clark (29 January 1940; GP/72/A(2), p.181).

62. Colin Coote to E.M.O'R. Dickey, December 1939 (GP/72/A(1), p.92).

63. H. Granville Fell, "Some Topics of the Moment: 'Art Made Tongue-tied by Authority'," Connoisseur, 107 (February 1941), p.79.

64. [F.C. Tilney], "The Eclipse of the Highbrow," Art and Reason, 7 #77 (May 1941), p.7.

65. Anonymous, "Artists in Uniform," Art & Industry, 34 (1943), p.74; GP/55/Ho-Hu - Ernest A. Holloway).

66. G. Elmslie Owen to John Aldridge, 2 June 1943 (GP/55/98); Colin Coote to E.C. Gregory, 20 July 1943 (GP/55/239).

67. Kenneth Clark to Mary Somerville (Broadcasting House), 29 May 1941 (GP/55/98); Alfred G.A. Janes to WAAC, 3 October 1941 (GP/55/Ga-Go - G.A. Janes); and correspondence dated 1942 and 1944 in GP/55/265. Among the artists who objected to giving serving artists extended leave to make art was James Boswell, who argued (in a letter published in the [AIA] Bulletin, (#72; May 1942) that the artists' fellow-servicemen would bear an unfair burden as a result.

68. The Displays, Exhibitions and Official Artists Division was one of five sections of the Publicity Branch of the MoI's General Production Division. More detailed information on the administrative organisation between the MoI and the WAAC is given in: GP/46/41; in MoI (in PRO): INF 1/32, INF 1/8, INF 1/23 and INF 1/143; and in Ian McLaine, Ministry of Morale: Home Front Morale and the Ministry of Information in World War II (London/Boston/Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1979), pp.7-10,118-121.

69. See correspondence dated March and April 1942 in MoI (in PRO): INF 1/143.

70. These administrative relationship between the WAAC and the MoI are outlined in letters dated January 1942, contained in MoI (in PRO): INF 1/143.

71. MoI, "Note of a Meeting Held at the Treasury on Friday, the 29th January [1943] at 2.45 to Consider the Position of Official War Artists" (MoI, ibid.).

72. Mr. Woodburn to Deputy Director-General, MoI, 15 January 1943 (MoI, ibid.). Though somewhat overstated, this summary was essentially accurate. The book of Kennington portraits was Drawing the R.A.F.: A Book of Portraits (Oxford University Press, 1942). Edward Bawden provided the illustrations for The Abyssinian Campaign: The Official Story of the Conquest of Italian East Africa (London: HMSO, c.1942). The four booklets of reproductions were all published by the Oxford University Press in 1942, as part of the War Pictures by British Artists series: War at Sea, Blitz, R.A.F. and Army; see Chapter 4, below.

73. S. Gates (MoI) to Deputy Director-General, MoI, 9 February 1943 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/143).

74. "Incubus": Deputy Director-General, MoI, to S. Gates (MoI), 9 February 1943 (MoI, ibid.). Three options: MoI, "Note of a Meeting Held at the Treasury on Friday, the 29th January [1943]," op.cit., p.4.

75. For example, Gates criticised the decision at length in a letter to the Deputy Director-General, 9 February 1943 (MoI, ibid.).

76. Mr. Woodburn to Deputy Director-General, MoI, 3 February 1943 (MoI, ibid.). War art had almost nothing to do with the affairs of the Home Division, but Dowden had been an Art Inspector for the Board of Education.

77. Details about the division of responsibilities between F.H. Dowden and WAAC personnel are taken from several letters, dated February and March 1943, all in MoI, ibid.

78. G. Elmslie Owen to F.H. Dowden and R.H. Parker, 13 May 1943 (GP/72/G(2), p.54. Documentation on the dispute over payment to Lewis is included in GP/55/267.

79. F.H. Dowden to R.H. Parker, 17 May 1943 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/143).

80. R.H. Parker to Deputy Director-General, MoI, 18 May 1943, op.cit.

81. F.H. Dowden[?], "Talk with Sir K. Clark on Official Artists" [May 1943] (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/143).

82. See especially: Charles Morris and Herbert Read, Eric Craven Gregory (Peter Gregory), 1887-1959: The Addresses in Tribute at the Cathedral, Bradford, on Monday 2 March 1959 by Sir Charles Morris, and at St. Luke's Church, Chelsea, on Thursday 5 March 1959 by Sir Herbert Read ([no publication data given]) ; Read's introductory text to the Leeds City Art Gallery's 1960 Gregory Memorial Exhibition, and Mark Haworth-Booth's E. McKnight Kauffer: A Designer and His Public (London: Gordon Fraser, 1979), pp.61-62.

83. J.A. (Alan) Barlow (Treasury) to Colonel Scorgie (MoI), 19 August 1940 (GP/46/B). The Treasury's wish to dismiss the War Office artists was noted in the Minutes of the WAAC's 3 July 1940 meeting.

84. Kenneth Clark to Col. Scorgie, 27 August 1940 (GP/46/B).

85. Scorgie's comments are taken from a typewritten memorandum dated 27 September 1940. Pick's remarks, dated 30 September, were appended in handwriting to this memorandum (GP/46/B).

86. E.M.O'R. Dickey to Kenneth Clark, n.d. [June 1941] (GP/46/B); Admiralty (in PRO): ADM 1/11494.

87. Cyril Radcliffe to E. St. J. Bamford (Deputy Director-General, MoI), 15 June 1943 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/143).

88. Kenneth Clark to E. St. J. Bamford, 9 December 1943 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/143).

89. L. Nash (MoI) to E.C. Gregory, 6 December 1943 (GP/72/ H(1), pp.35-37).

90. E.C. Gregory to E. St. J. Bamford, 3 March 1944 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/143).

## Chapter 4

### War Art as Propaganda

"Media used for the dissemination of propaganda include every form of communication, ranging from modern electronic and visual devices to the traditional streetcorner soap-box speaker. .... Because modern warfare involves the entire civilian population in addition to the military, government propaganda in such periods becomes of immense importance."

-The Columbia Encyclopedia,  
1935

"I think that far too many pictures are painted [by War Artists' Advisory Committee artists] for far too little purpose...."

-Cyril Radcliffe (Director-General, Ministry of Information), 1943<sup>1</sup>

### The MoI, the WAAC and the Idea of Propaganda

At their first meeting, in November 1939, the members of the War Artists' Advisory Committee agreed that "while artists should not necessarily be selected because their pictures were likely to reproduce well, yet this aspect should be borne in mind in making the selection."<sup>2</sup> This resolution was adopted at the insistence of the Ministry of Information which, being responsible for the production of government publicity and propaganda, was anxious to ensure that the war art should lend itself to photomechanical reproduction, and thus reach as broad an audience as possible. This was in keeping with the rationale that had originally been employed for establishing the WAAC within the MoI, rather than allowing the Armed Ser-



vices to administer their own war art projects. At that time it had been argued that war art was a publicity tool, and that the MoI was better-placed than the Armed Services to make appropriate use of it.

Yet although, as noted in Chapter 3, relations between the WAAC and the MoI degenerated over the issue of propaganda, it would be incorrect to assume that the Committee and the Ministry held irreconcilably different views on the subject. At no point did the MoI contend that the WAAC ought to make concern with the acquisition of blatant propaganda its principal activity. The first sentence of its terms of reference, as approved by the Ministry, specifically stated that the Committee's purpose was "to draw up a list of artists qualified to record the war [my emphasis] at home and abroad." Only then, in the second sentence, was the Committee charged to "advise on such questions as copyright, disposal and exhibition of works and the publication of reproductions." The MoI had other resources (notably, but not exclusively, its Studio Division), for the production of more blatant propaganda images (illustration 1). In any case the MoI recognised the value of not being perceived as a body that was willing to sacrifice the fine arts in the manipulation of wartime opinion. In the third month of the War, for example, it published an announcement that "in no circumstances shall we ... fasten our writers [or painters] in the Procrustean frame of propaganda."<sup>3</sup> It would therefore be disingenuous to argue that it

had strong reasons to expect the WAAC to fulfill a similar function.

In this regard it is also important to recall that "the Ministry" was not a monolithic unit with a single opinion on the usefulness of war art for propaganda purposes, and that one's thoughts about the value of the WAAC depended upon how one defined propaganda as a concept. The word "propaganda" was often wielded in correspondence between the MoI and the WAAC without any clear consensus having been established about its exact meaning.<sup>4</sup> Cecil Beaton, whose work was markedly personal, was particularly favoured by the Ministry. The latter employed him, with few interruptions, from March 1940 until the end of the War, and supported the publication of his war pictures in six books of reproductions.<sup>5</sup> Yet the bias in much of Beaton's work towards the decorative and evocative actually worked against the MoI's instructions to him to emphasise clearly and concisely the might of the British military. This discrepancy had the twin results of causing rumblings against Beaton from some Ministry officials, and of leading others to praise his photographs for their value as documents of an interpretive humanism that was believed to constitute a valuable propaganda tool in its own right.

Exactly the same praise and criticism was given to the WAAC, both in the press and at the MoI. In the press these divergent opinions were exemplified with startling clarity by two reviews of a 1940 exhibition of WAAC works. John Piper

described several of the pictures as "[not] summoning ... melodrama; [...not] wallowing in tragedy," but as possessing an "abstract quality [that] heightens the realism of the scene very much," and as lacking "that attempt to capture a scene which may never occur again that makes all war records, once their news value has gone, so intolerably dreary." Conversely, The Times published a letter from a pro-propaganda reader who blasted most of the exhibits as "little more than exercises in technique or mannerisms," and concluded by asking, "Cannot the War Artists' Committee stiffen its muscles and drive home the greatness of our cause and the need to defend it[?]"<sup>6</sup> Similarly, the MoI officials who objected most strenuously to funding the Committee were those to whom propaganda depended for its effect upon direct and unambiguous emotional impact. They reacted unfavourably to (for example) the WAAC's comments, in March 1941, on the apparently unobjectionable commissioning of portraits of well-known individuals as a recruiting aid for the Services represented by the sitters. On that occasion the members of the WAAC agreed "that portraits ... should be records for posterity done by the best available portrait artists. Neither speed in production nor the views of the sitter should be allowed unduly to influence the Committee's recommendations."<sup>7</sup> Shortly thereafter Kenneth Clark drew the other members' attention to "the undesirability of recommending the purchase of pictures solely for the purpose of propaganda in a particular place unless these pictures were of sufficient

importance in themselves as artistic war records."<sup>8</sup> At other times the Committee went even further, refusing to comply with censors who insisted that slight alterations be made to certain paintings (to enable them to be exhibited or reproduced), or even issuing contracts for pictures despite the certain knowledge that the proposed subjects were considered too sensitive to be made public.<sup>9</sup> (Fully 30% of the Committee's pictures stopped by the censors had been produced in fulfilment of short-term contracts, and another 33% had been purchased.<sup>1</sup>) The WAAC's 1942 annual report and request for funding concluded with a revealing summary of the goals of the Committee as defined by its members:

... We wish to make it clear that, although the use of the pictures for propaganda in a wide sense at the present time looms large in our Report, we have not forgotten that our chief task is to build up for posterity a collection of artistic war records of the highest quality. We also wish to state our belief that the pictures which artists working on our recommendation are producing are likely to provide a very useful stimulus to the art of painting in this country, and to public appreciation. This stimulus will, we hope, have a far-reaching influence on cultural activities in days to come, after the war is over.<sup>10</sup>

Statements such as this had been, and would continue to be, a source of irritation to those Ministry officials to whom "propaganda in the broad sense," as practised by the WAAC, was so

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix 3.

broad that it encompassed a range of questionable activities, while at the same time ignoring more traditionally propagandist approaches. There were, however, other members of the Ministry (including most notably Harold Macmillan and, later, Brendan Bracken) who had confidence in the importance of what could be termed "cultural propaganda," along with lines of that practised by the British Council. In the visual arts, cultural propaganda involved images that summarised abstract attributes of Britishness (including broad-mindedness, tolerance, and an interest in the individual) rather than functioning in a more obviously polemical way.<sup>2</sup> Such a "cultural" approach was exploited by the WAAC in two principal ways.<sup>3</sup>

The first of these involved a rather narrow and carefully-defined audience. In this the WAAC found a precedent in the approaches adopted during the First World War by employees of both Wellington House and the Department of Information. "It is better to influence those who can influence others than

---

<sup>2</sup> The notion of the WAAC as a supporter of "Britishness" is examined in Chapter 5 (especially in the first two sections, "Portraits," and "Home Front Subjects," as part of the Chapter's extended analysis of the subjects represented in the war art collection. See also the discussion, at the end of the present chapter, on the intentions and effects of the WAAC's war art exhibitions abroad.

<sup>3</sup> The discussion of the WAAC and propaganda, as given in this chapter, is not intended to imply that the use of war art as propaganda was the principal aim of the Committee, which also had very strong interests in compiling a visual record of the War, of using the wartime situation to prove the value of state patronage of art, of keeping artists active at their own profession during the War, and even of minimising the risk of violent death for certain artists.

attempt a direct appeal to the mass of the population," a Ministry of National Service official had claimed in 1918, in relation to the argument that printing reproductions of Muirhead Bone's drawings on recruiting posters made the posters "too good for the purpose of appealing to British workmen."<sup>11</sup> (The attempt to influence general opinion through the authority of groups with high social status and a strong interest in the arts was not employed during the Second World War. Instead, these latter groups were believed - by Clark, for example - to be more prone than other social groups to defeatism,<sup>12</sup> and were therefore made the targets of "cultural propaganda" for their own sakes.) Similarly, the First World War selection of official war artists (like John Lavery and William Orpen) who were socially prominent or particularly fashionable, was also motivated largely by an attempt to address a specific audience. So was the issuing of war art publications for which (as sales were to prove) only a tiny buying public existed.

By the time of the Second World War the need for the MoI to divide its audience into two general groups - one that was believed to be susceptible to comparatively flagrant propaganda and one that found such material repulsive - was even greater than it had been for Wellington House and the Department of Information in 1914-1918. Sensationalist books, such as Arthur Ponsonby's Falsehood in Wartime (1928), had exposed the extreme deceptiveness of much First World War

propaganda. This had engendered even more cynicism within those groups, defined by the education levels and the social status or pretensions of their members, that had tended to reject unmistakably propagandist imagery during the First World War.

The latter-day MoI also needed to take into consideration the marriage of art and undisguised propaganda that had taken place in the Soviet Union under Stalin, and later in Germany under the National Socialists. The latter was, of course, of particular importance during the War, when the need to differentiate between Britain and Germany on every level was paramount. By 1939 Britain had a sizeable population of refugee artists whose art had fallen into disfavour at home. Whatever one thought of contemporary art, it had become increasingly difficult to accept Hitler's campaign against artists who declined to produce representations of well-scrubbed Aryans marching confidently into the future. Those members of the population who found even the work of members of the Artists' International Association too concerned with proselytising could therefore hardly be expected to be receptive to war art if the latter seemed comparable in intention and/or appearance to the propaganda art of Nazi Germany.

The need to recognise all of these considerations, and the effect that the latter had had on educated opinion about propaganda, was emphasised by the International Propaganda and Broadcasting Enquiry in 1939. The Enquiry recommended that the

MoI institute a policy of appealing to "the educated minority," by employing propaganda that was "subtle and indirect."<sup>13</sup> As for cinema, the head of the Ministry's Film Division was warned in the House of Lords that "if his department is going to make propaganda films he should be very careful. The obvious propaganda film never creates the effect intended."<sup>14</sup>

The members of the WAAC were aware of these many considerations regarding the dangers of propaganda, and took to heart the lesson that propaganda was a multi-level tool, each level of which had its optimum degree of effectiveness when directed towards a particular constituency. The audience towards which the Committee therefore seems to have directed much of its effort regarding art as propaganda was made up of well-educated supporters of the arts. It would be pointless to attempt to change the views of these people by bombarding them with images that they would identify as propaganda, and that (in the traditions of Clive Bell and T.S. Eliot) they might therefore equate with mass culture and the denial of true culture. The perceived invasion, by propaganda, of the autonomous realm of aesthetics, would only have convinced them that Britain was slipping into moral degeneracy. It was apparently with this awareness that in 1940, as a member of the MoI's Home Morale Emergency Committee, Clark advised that "serious" entertainment ("not so much the immediate entertainment of the film or music hall order, but something to occupy people's minds") had much to recommend it insofar as it would



bolster receptivity to Ministry propaganda.<sup>15</sup> Similarly, he argued for the use of Eric Kennington's pastel portraits as veiled propaganda addressed to those who considered themselves well-informed about art, because "even if [...the portraits are] a little too distinguished for a certain section of the public ... I am convinced that we shall never make our point by constantly playing down to the lowest common denominator."<sup>16</sup>

The appeal to a small audience that was presumed to be prone to defeatism was thus one of the approaches adopted by the WAAC to the use of art as propaganda. This had its most demonstrably successful effect in the exhibitions that the Committee organised for circulation abroad. (These are discussed in some detail towards the end of this chapter.) The second approach took as its intended audience the general population. The latter, during the Battle of Britain, was not regarded by the government as being defeatist. Nonetheless the privations and other difficulties of a prolonged war - and especially one in which there was expectation of the post-war implementation of broad improvements in the equity of social organisation - suggested that good will could be encouraged by the demonstration that the government was concerned with the welfare of the entire citizenry. The war art project could make a contribution in this area through the implication that the government was attempting - at a time when interest in the arts was spreading throughout much of the population - to

enrich the lives of "ordinary" people. This meshed conveniently with Kenneth Clark's wish (noted in Chapter 2) to take advantage of wartime conditions to raise the level of public taste, and it had its clearest success in the WAAC's art exhibitions held in Britain. (In November 1939 he published an article praising the idea of circulating art exhibitions from London to the provinces, and specifically argued that such exhibitions would, ideally, raise the national taste in art.<sup>17</sup> See below, "WAAC Exhibitions.")

The fact that both of the WAAC's approaches to the use of war art was distanced from blatant propaganda techniques, was essential to their success. By studiously avoiding clearly propagandist imagery in its pictures of the War, the WAAC was seen to be embodying the high-mindedness and generosity of spirit that was, presumably, a central constituent element of British society. This was a commonplace proposition during the War, and one that was not limited to the WAAC. The MoI itself went to some trouble to promote these and comparably desirable qualities as being essentially and irrevocably British. In 1942, for example, it formulated a policy to discredit specific aspects of Nazism, by comparing them unfavourably with "British" ideals and characteristics. The Ministry concluded that what was needed was not so much a campaign of anti-German propaganda, but rather one that praised, for example, Britain's attainment and preservation, even in times of national crisis, of the ideals of social justice and human rights.<sup>18</sup>

Analogously, the BBC took care to cultivate a reputation for objectivity and accuracy, in conscious (but rarely-stated) contrast to the bluster and bias of German broadcasting. One of the Corporation's greatest fears was that it would lose its credibility if it was believed to be forsaking objectivity to indulge in a Germanic display of bravado. In Graham Bell's tellingly-worded estimation, to pervert a free culture into an oppressive one would be the equivalent of committing "racial suicide."

The WAAC avoided implications of "racial suicide" in two ways. The first of these involved acquiring art that often emphasised subjects that expanded the category of "war art" to include imagery that did not do anything so propagandistically crude and obvious as actually denigrating the enemy. These included portraits of civilians, as well as pictures of Land Girls, architectural landmarks, factory work, evacuees being entertained by their host families, servicemen performing mundane duties or relaxing, and so forth (e.g., illustrations 2,8-11,13). The second was by downplaying the importance of subject matter altogether. Art, as a medium of communication hierarchically differentiated from straight propaganda illustrations or cartoons, seemed to endorse the values of variety and subjectivity by offering a proliferation of points of view in place of a single, uncompromising reading. (The catholicity of taste that the WAAC demonstrated in the building of the war art collection was also relevant in this regard, insofar as it

suggested that the Committee was not imposing an "official" style upon the viewing public.) This emphasis on a multiplicity of viewpoints, could be (and was) contrasted with the situation of the arts in Germany. As the anonymous author of a 1939 article in The Times claimed,

...The effect of Nazidom has been to adulterate the arts by saddling them with a political purpose. .... It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the fundamental falseness of Nazidom is expressed in its treatment of the arts....

.... There is room for the comic, sentimental, or patriotic song, and their visual equivalents, and there is even something to be said for artistic propaganda, but if we are wise we shall regard these values as incidental and bank rather on that direct appeal of art, irrespective of subject interest or purpose....<sup>19</sup>

One of the most eloquent statements of this principal was made by Herbert Read, in his response to an assertion (published by J.B. Nicholas in Art & Industry) that "escapist arguments" were being advanced "to defend one of the nation's hobbies when the nation's life is in danger."<sup>20</sup> According to Read,

I confess I don't know quite how to deal with such a crude misunderstanding of art. Admittedly it represents the unconscious attitude of a great part of the nation, but one does not often meet with such an open confession of ignorance. I prefer to call it ignorance, for the alternative is to call it Fascism. .... A Fascist knows that art is always potentially dangerous to any established order, especially when that order denies that liberty is essential to art.

.... What Mr. Nicholas calls one of the nation's hobbies is actually the most serious, the most fateful and the most essential activity upon which a nation can engage. It is, in fact, the definition of its civilisation - of its conception of the purpose of life and the meaning of existence.<sup>21</sup>

Propaganda, in this view, betrayed its origins of intolerance and dictatorial rhetoric in the way that it refused to allow the viewer to formulate alternative opinions. According to Clark the very intentions upon which blatant propaganda was based were degrading. He therefore argued that to work in visual propaganda was unhealthy for an artist's creative development because it "tended to coarsen his style and degrade his vision."<sup>22</sup> In contrast, art offered liberation rather than restriction, and thus encapsulated within itself the very qualities that the MoI was elsewhere engaged in proclaiming as quintessentially British. In a related vein, such leading military figures as General Wavell wrote introductions to volumes of poetry, claiming that poetry (introspective, and requiring its readers to think for themselves) captured the essence of the British national character.<sup>23</sup>

The fact that the war art collection had been amassed with government funds thus became a fact of vital importance, as it implied that the British state was content to support (rather than control) art as a part of its war effort. The unstated contrast with Germany was too obvious to ignore.

An indication of the success of the WAAC's manipulation

of propaganda techniques may be given by surveying press reviews written by critics who recognised the Committee's attempts to appeal to a self-defined cultural elite. These reviewers (whose writings were usually published only in the "quality" press) tended to reserve their most sustained praise for those artworks that depended for much of their appeal upon their status as "modern masterpieces" for viewers who characterised themselves as having the taste and training to appreciate them as such. Muirhead Bone, for example, was repeatedly praised for his careful attention to detailed draughtsmanship in works such as St. Bride's and the City After the Fire (illustration 6). This drawing focuses on a emotional subject: the gutted frame of one of Wren's finest churches, and the still-intact St. Paul's. The point of view is highly dramatic, looking down towards the dome of St. Paul's as though the artist were riding in an attacking aircraft. Yet, with remarkable consistency, reviewers tended to brush past these points fairly quickly, preferring to spend as much or more time dwelling upon Bone's drawing technique, as if the latter were the point of the picture. A comparable emphasis on the war artists as inspired creators who could elevate potentially trite propaganda subjects to the level of true art was evident in Eric Newton's 1940 reaction to the news of Paul Nash's appointment as an official war artist to the Air Ministry. Newton described it as "a daring appointment - rather like asking T.S. Eliot to write a report on the Louis-Farr fight or Stra-

vinsky to compose a march for the Grenadier Guards."<sup>24</sup> By implying that a precondition for understanding certain war pictures was an awareness of increasingly wide ranges of cultural references, Newton neutralised any overtones the pictures may have had as propaganda, and thus made them objects of intense interest.<sup>25</sup>

A comparably favourable reaction was especially common regarding drawings and paintings that seemed to embody formal characteristics associated with "the British school." Art critics based much of their praise for what they called the renaissance of British art upon the notion that the country had become an island fortress in which artists had perforce been thrown back upon British traditions in the visual arts.<sup>26</sup> To be able to identify these traditions was not construed as showing the sort of narrow patriotism that audiences hostile to blatant propaganda associated with representations of John Bull, for example. Instead, the emphasis was placed upon the viewer's awareness of art historical detail, and upon suggesting that war art - far from being propagandist in intention - was actually the most recent manifestation of a centuries-old British tradition.

In this connection it hardly seems coincidental that Edward Ardizzone's drawings (illustration 12) were repeatedly compared by critics to those of Thomas Rowlandson. (Significantly, this comparison was frequently suggested in the WAAC's press releases, and in the published work of Kenneth Clark.)

Similarly, the war art of such Neo-Romantic artists as Graham Sutherland, John Piper and Henry Moore (illustration 7) was singled out for praise for its traditionally British emphasis upon visionary or poetic intensity, often focused upon the land, or upon local and national history. The qualities of narrative interest and visionary intensity were attributed, by Clark and others, to a pantheon of British luminaries, including Shakespeare, Blake, Gilray and Cruickshank.<sup>27</sup>

In fact Neo-Romantic art, by combining formal complexity with reference to themes and interests that were assumed to be deeply rooted in British culture, became the model of war art for those members of the "cultural elite" whom the WAAC deemed to be in need of encouragement from art as subtle propaganda. Eric Newton spoke directly to those viewers when he described Sutherland's drawings of bomb damage in London as having "a wild, crucified poignancy that gives the war a new meaning," and when he concluded this review by stating, "I honestly believe that the best of these war pictures mark the beginning of a renaissance in English art."<sup>28</sup> In 1943 Sutherland's Blitz pictures struck the art reviewer of Penguin New Writing as works that gave viewers "a powerful feeling of exuberance," as much because of their intense evocation of humanism as because of the artist's complex manipulation of his mixed media technique.<sup>29</sup> Henry Moore's shelter drawings were regularly praised for their adventurousness of style and for their evocation of the human condition as a whole.<sup>30</sup> These were important aspects



to consider in relation to Moore's art, of course; but what is remarkable is the comparative infrequency with which critics addressed his drawings as records of a contemporary event. Analysing them in terms of their evocation of the endurance of human unity and sympathy removed them from the context of the present, and propaganda.

the MoI's attempts to publicise the war art collection were manifested in publications and exhibitions. As is argued below, the first of these was generally regarded as a failure, and the second as a success. The remainder of this chapter examines the Committee's activities in these areas in some detail, charting their relative degrees of success and failure and suggesting reasons to account for this apparent discrepancy. The subsequent chapter explores (inter alia) specific ways in which the subjects represented in the war art collection promoted the diffusion of subtle ideas of the value of British traditions, attitudes and attributes.

#### WAAC Publications and Reproductions

During the First World War C.F. Masterman, who administered the Wellington House war art project, had specialised in the production of booklets, magazines and printed ephemera illustrated by the war artists. Both the Ministry of Information and the War Artists' Advisory Committee therefore had a precedent for anticipating the use of the Second World War art

collection as illustrations in newspapers, magazines and books, as well as in the form of postcards, calendars, and so on.

That comparable publication/reproduction opportunities existed in 1939-1945 is evident in even a partial list of books published during the War and illustrated with war art. Yet few of these were produced at the behest of the WAAC, even when the illustrations used were by its own artists. Eric Kennington's brother, for example, anxious to make employees in his aircraft factory feel the urgency of the War and the importance of their contribution of their work to it, paid for the publication of a collection of Kennington's larger-than-life portraits, accompanied by brief texts extolling the extraordinary spirit shown by the sitters on a daily basis. Published in 1941 as Pilots, Workers, Machines,<sup>31</sup> the booklet so impressed Lord Beaverbrook (then Minister of Aircraft Production) with its potential to boost morale amongst factory workers, that he ordered 50,000 copies.<sup>32</sup> Another volume of Kennington portraits, Drawing the R.A.F.: A Book of Portraits (Oxford University Press, 1942), was no more subtle, but was sufficiently popular to spawn a 1943 companion volume, Tanks and Tank-folk. The latter, a collection of twenty-one of Kennington's portrait drawings of Royal Armoured Corps personnel, was financed by Vauxhall Motors and published by Country Life. Two other artists who worked for the WAAC also published books of their wartime portraits, both in 1942 and

neither with the sponsorship of the Committee: William Rothenstein (Men of the R.A.F.; Oxford University Press) and Cuthbert Orde (Pilots of Fighter Command: Sixty-four Portraits; George P. Harrap & Company Ltd). In text and illustrations both exploited the same sentiments of patriotic heroism and duty that were being mined so successfully in the Kennington books.<sup>33</sup>

That these projects were originated and executed outside of the WAAC justified some of the MoI's increasing criticism of the Committee. Yet the factors contributing to this situation were more various and complex than the Ministry allowed.

Within the context of the present discussion, the most important of these concerned the size of the "cultural elite" audience upon which Clark believed war art had its strongest propaganda impact. Results in this area were difficult to measure, and several MoI officials were reluctant to invest appreciable amounts of funding in it. Disagreement peaked in a debate over whether to issue a war art periodical or a series of "numbers." The latter were intended to be thematic in nature, each issue being illustrated with reproductions relevant to one particular subject, whereas the periodical would be more akin to a fine art magazine devoted to war art as a genre. In December 1939 the WAAC recorded its preference for the publication of the periodical, rather than the series of numbers. The latter would, it was felt, appeal to a broad audience with a general interest in the War; but a monthly

periodical "of outstanding artistic quality" would be of interest to a smaller group of "influential people who would appreciate a finely produced publication":<sup>34</sup>

...The ordinary art magazines are not in any case likely to have a wide circulation during the war, and ... the production of a fine periodical of the kind contemplated, which would appeal to the intelligentsia, would be useful propaganda, especially since some of those who would buy it might be the very people who needed a stimulus. "Picture Post" and other cheap illustrated papers would provide a channel for reproductions to reach a wider public.<sup>35</sup>

The Ministry of Information, however, pointed out that the project was likely to be an expensive one, and that the money involved could be better spent by ensuring that a larger audience was reached. In 1940, therefore, it approved the series of numbers and rejected the proposed periodical - a decision to which the WAAC agreed only with reluctance, and only when it became clear that the Ministry had no intentions of debating the point any further.<sup>36</sup> Ironically, restrictions imposed by the Treasury early in 1940 on most types of "luxury" printing for home consumption killed the project,<sup>37</sup> and neither the Ministry nor the Committee revived their proposals.

However, the option of publishing books remained. As early as October 1940 the WAAC had discussed plans for a variety of such projects.<sup>38</sup> Yet only one of them eventually came to fruition; in 1942 the Oxford University Press produced

a set of four very short one-shilling publications under the series title War Pictures by British Artists.<sup>39</sup> Each book consisted of a brief but enthusiastic text, and approximately fifty black-and-white reproductions chosen to illustrate specific themes: War at Sea (text by Admiral W.H. Richmond), Blitz (J.B. Morton), R.A.F. (H.E. Bates) and Army (Colin Coote). Like the First World War series The Western Front, to which they were essentially a modern counterpart, the OUP books were smartly produced, received good reviews,<sup>40</sup> and found a large audience. A prefatory note by Kenneth Clark appeared in each volume:

What did it look like? they will ask in 1981, and no amount of description or documentation will answer them. Nor will big, formal compositions like the battle pictures which hang in palaces; and even photographs, which tell us so much, will leave out the colour and the peculiar feeling of events in these extraordinary years. Only the artist with his heightened powers of perception can recognise which elements in a scene can be pickled for posterity in the magical essence of style. And as new subjects begin to saturate his imagination, they create a new style, so that from the destruction of war something of lasting value emerges.

The uneasy compromise between the MoI and the WAAC over the purposes of such publications is detectable in the variance between this preface on the one hand, and the longer texts (by Richmond, Morton, Bates and Coote). Clark's text was about art as record, and more specifically about the truth content of art that emphasised subjectivity and interpretation. Converse-

ly, Richmond (for example) made repeated reference to the illustrations, but only to indicate the variety of subjects available to artists painting Admiralty pictures; he had little to say about the images as works of art.<sup>41</sup> The other authors made even less frequent mention of the illustrations, preferring instead to engage in a brand of flag-waving much admired by supporters of unequivocal propaganda. Bates, for example, devoted almost his entire text to an analysis of how portraits of airmen revealed their apparently incorruptible bravery, modesty and humour.<sup>42</sup> Even Coote addressed himself to the reproductions only to suggest that it was "a matter of opinion" whether or not the artists produced better work before or during the War."<sup>43</sup> Only Morton acknowledged the importance of the WAAC's technique of scoring propaganda points by downplaying associations with traditional ideas of propagandist imagery. "Those who hold that to tell the truth is the most effective form of propaganda will find their demand satisfied by the pictures reproduced in this book [R.A.F.]," he claimed.<sup>44</sup>

The four books were printed in an edition of 24,000 and, within fewer than six months of publication, had been almost entirely sold out.<sup>45</sup> This prompted the OUP to publish a second, equally successful series: Women (Laura Knight), Production (Cecil Beaton), Soldiers (William Coldstream), and Air Raids (Stephen Spender). Yet, with the exception of Knight (who managed, while praising women's participation in the War,

not to mention art at all),<sup>46</sup> the texts in the second series were markedly different from those in the first. Spender, for example, considered the appropriateness of assigning such Neo-Romantic artists as Graham Sutherland and John Piper to record scenes of devastation.<sup>47</sup> Beaton argued that the war art being produced in c.1942-1943 was more emotionally convincing than that of c.1940-1941.<sup>48</sup> In this way the second series seemed much more of a WAAC than an MoI production, addressed to an audience that may have found the first series' texts somewhat obtrusive or inappropriate in books of art reproductions.

Probably the most desirable aspects of the eight OUP books, from the point of view of the MoI, were their format and their price. Insofar as each focused entirely on a specific war-related subject, they were remarkably similar in appearance to the series of numbers earlier supported by the Ministry. In addition, because the numbers had been intended to appeal to a general audience that was not thought to be willing to spend much money on art books, a low price had been deemed essential. The Oxford University Press booklets, at 2/3 apiece, sold very well. The MoI had apparently been pleased to recommend to the Paper Controller that extra supplies of paper be released to the Press for the project, whereas none of the more expensive books suggested by the WAAC were convincingly supported by the Ministry in this way. These WAAC proposals included one (made in 1943) to publish a half-crown book of colour reproductions. Price was apparently less of an issue in

another WAAC proposal (also in 1943) to publish Anthony Gross' pictures from Burma and Leslie Cole's from Malta<sup>4</sup> as "very interesting cheap Ministry of Information publications";<sup>49</sup> but this project was equally unsuccessful in gaining Ministry support. This was possibly because booklets devoted entirely to the work of Gross and Cole might have seemed more likely to attract a small audience with specific interests in those artists, than a large audience with a more general interest in the War. After the 1943 OUP series of War Pictures by British Artists, and excluding catalogues published to accompany exhibitions of war art, it was not until 1945 that another book of war pictures appeared: War Through Artists' Eyes: Paintings and Drawings by British War Artists. Published by John Murray, it featured a brief introduction by Eric Newton. The latter was a strong supporter of the WAAC through his exhibition reviews published in The Sunday Times and The Manchester Guardian. It was therefore not surprising that his text for War Through Artists' Eyes emphasised the need for the war artists

---

<sup>4</sup> Gandhi's civil disobedience movement represented a threat at a time when Indian withdrawal from the War would have been tactically and psychologically devastating. The India Office specifically requested the Ministry of Information to publicise good British-Indian relations, one of the cornerstones of which was the military cooperation of the two countries in Burma. As part of his duties as an official artist to the War Office, Gross was assigned to record the work of Indian troops in 1942-1943, before and during the Arakan campaign; see illustration 5. Leslie Cole was given official war artist status with the Ministry of Information and sent to Malta in May 1943 to record Royal Army, Navy and Air Force work there. Malta had attracted the WAAC's attention as a result of the German siege mounted against it from mid-1940 until the end of 1942.



to balance accuracy of observation with personal interpretation, these being the qualities that Clark and most of his colleagues on the WAAC argued were particularly important.

Differences of opinion between the MoI and the WAAC over who could be expected or should be encouraged to purchase war art booklets was thus a key stumbling block to the Committee's publishing plans. The Committee itself, though it put its greatest faith in the support of a comparatively small purchasing audience, nonetheless hoped that reproductions of its pictures could also find a larger audience. It therefore embarked on a series of projects to probe the market.

Unfortunately the WAAC's efforts were largely thwarted by factors that were beyond its control. One of the most severe was the contemporary paper shortage, and the consequent restrictions of the Treasury on "luxury" printing for distribution within Britain. The restrictions were the targets of occasionally successful petitions of protest following their introduction early in 1940,<sup>50</sup> but the small gains made in this way were wiped out when the Paper Controller issued Statutory Rule and Order No.1760 in November 1941. The Order forbade the production, from paper or wood pulp, of a variety of items, including "any view card or picture postcard intended to be exposed or offered for sale by retail; ... any greeting card or other greeting intended for sale; [or] ... any calendar containing a greater weight of paper than 4 ounces...."<sup>51</sup>

Publication of reproductions of war art in newspapers and

magazines was also restricted by the exigencies of paper rationing. As newspapers decreased in length to about twelve pages, their editors had little choice but to continue their pre-war habit of relying heavily upon illustrations that were of topical interest. These, almost without exception, were photographs; works from the WAAC collection were printed only when a newspaper took notice of the opening of a war art exhibition.<sup>52</sup> The Sunday Times, which the Committee had hoped would show a degree of interest in printing reproductions of war art, submitted only one such request during the War. Even when the WAAC offered to guarantee first publication rights, only the publishers of The Illustrated London News showed sustained interest. Reproductions of WAAC art were published in approximately 10% of The ILN's wartime issues.<sup>53</sup>

Perhaps a more aggressive campaign to have reproductions published in the press would have achieved better results. However the MoI itself actually applied minimal pressure towards this end. This was probably because - with the exceptions of The Times, Picture Post and The Illustrated London News - British newspapers and magazines tended not to be circulated to neutral countries, where the need to encourage pro-British sentiment was greatest. In addition, the largest mass-circulation magazines in the United States did not share the WAAC's views on the counter-productive effect of overblown drama on the efficacy of war art. Changing public opinion in neutral America was a top priority at the MoI, but it quickly

became obvious that reproductions of war paintings would not be helpful in this respect. The editors of American magazines "have the most fantastic ideas about the war," wrote the Director of the Ministry's Photographic Division in October 1940. "Hardly a single picture has come up to their Hollywood ideas."<sup>54</sup>

The WAAC also regarded the Ministry as being somewhat obstructive of its publication hopes in another way. The Committee relied upon the MoI to pay the salary of its Secretary and his staff. Until April 1943 the latter consisted of only one person, and from then onwards of two (a research assistant and a clerk/typist). The Committee therefore lacked the resources needed to process incoming art, issue contracts, maintain contact with its artists, keep up-to-date in its voluminous correspondence, organise exhibitions, and still make arrangements for publications and reproductions.

There is also evidence that similar staffing problems, having what was believed to be a direct effect on the work of the WAAC, also existed both in the MoI's Photographic Division,<sup>55</sup> as well as on the interface between the MoI and the WAAC. When, in the spring of 1941, Kenneth Clark conceded that criticism about poor distribution of reproductions was merited, he blamed the problem on a lack of effective communication between the various sections of the Ministry. "The various [MoI internal] specialists - publishing, marketing, etc.," he wrote, "... will forget all about them [WAAC artworks] unless

there is one person whose job it is to use them." However, the administrative structure of the Ministry was unfavourable to the hiring of one person to do a job that would necessarily require him or her to interfere in the several separate divisions (Photographic, Publications, Empire, American, etc.) that might make use of reproductions of war art. The Ministry did respond to Clark's concern (if not to his specific recommendation) by arranging for Robert Fraser, from its Publications Division, to take on the responsibility of liaising between the Committee and the Controller of Production. One of Fraser's first actions, taken in cooperation with E.M.O'R. Dickey, was to propose an agenda of projects for increasing the existing levels of awareness of war art within Britain.<sup>56</sup> Although the intention was to identify new ways of marketing the war art collection and of keeping the Committee in the public eye, the recommendations made by Parker and Dickey did not differ significantly from those that had been made by the WAAC itself in a paper prepared fifteen months earlier.<sup>57</sup> Nor does Fraser seem to have continued his work with the WAAC after April 1941.

Whether or not Clark's contention that better house-keeping would result in greater public demand for reproductions of war art is debatable. The MoI, however, appears to have believed that it would not. Certainly the sales statistics for WAAC products were almost always discouraging. Clark himself had warned, in 1940, that the market for publications

and reproductions would probably be weaker than he supposed it to have been during the First World War, when "the general standard of reproduction was lower, and the reproductions of official war artists' work, being unusually good, had a special appeal."<sup>58</sup> In the field of printed ephemera (postcards, calendars, bookmarks, Christmas cards and related paraphernalia)<sup>59</sup> the Committee contracted reproduction work out to private companies, largely in the hope that they would be able to repeat their First World War success in achieving extensive overseas distribution through their international connections.<sup>60</sup> In 1940 a Christmas card showing Charles Cundall's large, elaborate and much-publicised oil painting The Withdrawal from Dunkirk (illustration 18) earned slightly more than £34 - a sum which led the WAAC to assume the existence of a significant potential market for reproductions of war art. Yet despite offers of exclusivity of use for the pictures they chose to reproduce, most publishers suspected (correctly) that they were unlikely to do other than take a financial loss, even if they selected popular pictures.<sup>61</sup>

The WAAC's experiment with public interest in lithographs and etchings on war subjects was comparably disappointing. These prints, commissioned in 1940 from Ethel Gabain, A.S. Hartrick and Hubert Freeth, were small, uncoloured images that received little attention in the press. They also depended upon finding buyers at a time when the art market was only beginning to recover from the trauma induced by the outbreak

of the War, and so their lack of sales success was not entirely surprising. It was, however, symptomatic of a larger trend regarding the sale of individual reproductions of items from the war art collection. The same lack of public demand was shown for photographs of war art. By the end of 1943 sales of photographs to private individuals were averaging only twenty per month, mostly to grieving relatives asking for reproductions of portraits of Services personnel killed in action.<sup>62</sup>

Indeed, the only genuinely successful WAAC-originated publication of single-sheet reproductions appears to have owed its success to the fact that the prints were supplied not to private buyers, but to canteens, British Restaurants, messes, and other Armed Services' and war workers' facilities.<sup>63</sup> They were therefore very large (25" x 30"), brightly-coloured, and based upon paintings (by Paul Nash, Barnett Freedman, Edward Ardizzone and Stanley Spencer; illustration 10) that had received substantial press attention and that were visually challenging. Only fragmentary sales statistics are extant, but it is known that the WAAC regarded the venture as financially successful.<sup>64</sup>

However aside from these lithographic reproductions, and the two Oxford University Press series of booklets, the WAAC could point to few successes in its attempts to spark widespread interest in reproductions and photographs of war art. Certainly the MoI seems to have had little faith in these activities, and gave only sporadic assistance to the Commit-

tee's projects. The Committee's experiments in the production of books and reproductions thus became trapped in a vicious circle, exacerbated by such additional factors as paper shortages. Nor was the WAAC strongly disposed to expend the labour of its tiny staff on pursuing other plans to break out of that circle. The tendency to failure of the projects to market reproductions of war art probably confirmed not only the WAAC's original belief that the purchasing audience for war art was strictly limited, but also the Committee's characterisation of the circumstances under which war art would be useful as propaganda against almost any audience. This characterisation had been based upon the assumption that clearly warlike imagery was not the determining factor in the effectiveness of art as propaganda, but rather that this effectiveness depended upon the artworks' abilities to confirm the attributes that made the British state preferable, in a moral sense, to its German counterpart. Art was therefore important primarily as artefact, not as image, whereas reproductions of war art emphasised the latter. Conversely, exhibitions could bring the population into direct contact with the artefacts themselves. The WAAC therefore chose to concentrate its efforts between mid-1940 and the end of 1945 on the organisation of public displays of war art.

### WAAC Exhibitions

In comparison to its publication projects, which were undertaken on an erratic and restricted basis, the WAAC's exhibitions programme operated on a much more regular schedule and on a larger scale. As of 31 January 1944, for example, the Committee calculated that it owned 3486 pictures, of which slightly more than half were on exhibition, or were scheduled to go on exhibition in the near future.<sup>65</sup> Reviewing their work at the end of the War, the members claimed that their aim had been twofold: to collect pictures of artistic worth that were also likely to be of historic interest as war records, and "to stimulate by their exhibitions public interest in such aspects of the war as the artist, with his personal vision, can illuminate as no merely factual record can."<sup>66</sup> Written from the vantage point afforded by 1945, this statement's heavy emphasis on art exhibitions, and its ignoring of the subject of publications and reproductions, had not been shared by statements of purpose made at the beginning of the War. As suggested earlier in this chapter, exhibitions within Britain were valuable as propaganda insofar as they tended to emphasise the high-mindedness of the government's apparent refusal to force the arts "down" to the level of propaganda, and its readiness to employ war art to expose a broader public to art as a field of interest. Abroad, the Committee's exhibitions functioned to reinforce pro-British opinion in countries that were already at war, and to sway opinion in neutral America in favour of



participation in the War.

The subject of exhibitions of WAAC art within Britain is implicated within the larger issues of public interest in art exhibitions in general, and in displays of war art in particular. Leisure patterns undoubtedly changed during the 1930's, but the principal shift was away from localised and class-based pursuits (clubs, bands, chapels and so on) and towards activities which could be centrally organised and monopolised by an entertainment industry anxious to benefit from the reduced work hours and higher wages enjoyed by much of the population. Dance halls, cinemas and the holiday industries, not art galleries, were the most widely popular leisure centres of the day. Especially before c.1942, attendance at art exhibitions was largely restricted to a section of the population that defined itself as a cultured elite.<sup>67</sup>

However, as noted in Chapter 1, interest in the arts began to increase markedly in c.1942, at least among members of the middle classes. The dispersal of urban populations into rural areas (either for safety or work) had resulted in the establishment of regional and local art societies and clubs. The provision of art exhibitions, classical music concerts, opera productions and theatrical performances by groups ranging from CEMA to the Hallé Orchestra and the Royal Shakespeare Company fostered an increased interest in the arts, in parts of the country that had hitherto enjoyed little exposure to

what had long been predominantly a city-based culture. John Rothenstein subsequently agreed that by 1942 a pervasive curiosity had replaced the earlier indifference towards "high-brow" cultural activities. The exhibitions organised by the WAAC took their place within this context of growing general curiosity about the arts. Especially outside of London, the WAAC was as much a catalyst as a beneficiary of that curiosity.

On the subject of exhibitions of war art in particular, contemporary sources showed less consensus, though they did tend to lean towards the opinion that the War was not a particularly welcome theme in entertainment. This was the conclusion reached by Mass-Observation in 1940, at least regarding women's preferences in leisure activities.<sup>68</sup> By mid-September 1939 the BBC had reinstated its pre-war schedule after noting the unpopularity of programming that interspersed frequent news reports with musical interludes. Although twenty-five songs about the War were recorded by the end of November 1939, few gained much popularity. Bless 'em All later (1941) became a rare exception. The White Cliffs of Dover (1941), a war song primarily by association, was a great success, as was (inappropriately, and over the objections of the MoI) Lili Marlene. The War was the subject of 30% of all references in music hall performances during the first months of the War, but had dwindled to fewer than 5% by the summer of 1940. The Blackpool Fun Fair, held during the August bank holiday weekend that

year, had only one side show using the War as its theme.<sup>69</sup>

Similarly, of the seventy-three plays produced in central London between September 1939 and the end of March 1940 almost exactly half were comedies. Only thirteen were dramas, and few or none of the latter took the War as their theme.<sup>70</sup> Flarepath by Terence Ratigan ran for eighteen months beginning in August 1942, and Esther McCracken's No Medals opened in October 1944 and closed after VE Day; but these plays, based on the War, were atypical in their success.<sup>71</sup> Films that dealt with topical subjects tended to be well-received only if they were not "excessively realistic or particularly unpleasant." A poll in 1940 showed that 18% of cinema-goers wanted fewer war films, against 2.5% who wanted more. People seemed to take an interest in war movies after 1939 only if they had taken a particular interest in them during peacetime.<sup>72</sup> Novels about the conflict sold well, but generally not as well as classics of English literature. Poetry of all types was almost as much in demand as books on current affairs, with even lesser-known poets selling extremely well.<sup>73</sup>

These general tendencies were made explicit in a public opinion survey, taken in the summer of 1942, in which 49% of respondents stated that they thought the War as a theme was overdone and undesirable, and that they did their best to avoid it. Another 27% said that their receptivity to such a theme depended upon its treatment, but only 14% claimed to actively seek out forms of entertainment that were based upon

it. It was felt that War themes tended to be trivialised by being treated in too glamorous a way, and that their treatment too often seemed to be blatantly propagandist in intent. The latter point must have been greeted warmly by members of the WAAC.

The critical and public popularity of exhibitions by Wyndham Lewis, C.R.W. Nevinson, Paul Nash and others during the First World War nonetheless encouraged at least some gallery owners to seek similar audiences beginning in 1939. Comparable exhibitions that were held in London during the War included those by Clifford Hall (at Leger's, in 1941), Feliks Topolski (at Thos. Agnew & Sons, in 1942), Geza Szobel (at the Czechoslovak Institute, in 1942), and Terence Cuneo (at Palatin Fine Arts, in 1942).<sup>74</sup> Yet this was not the general trend for commercial galleries and exhibiting societies. Only 4% of the pictures at the Royal Academy's 1940 annual exhibition were of war subjects. This rose to 14.5% in 1941 (in reaction to the Blitz), but slumped to 6.5% in 1942.<sup>75</sup> An official at Thos. Agnew & Sons wanted a cheerful show by the Contemporary Art Society in November 1939, and told an interviewer that war pictures would not have been hung even if they had been submitted. The Secretary of the Goupil Gallery said the same about an exhibition held there at approximately the same time. An examination conducted by Mass-Observation indicated that of the 1220 works shown at eight dealers' exhibitions held between September and December 1939, only thirty-six (or one in

thirty) referred in some way to the War.<sup>76</sup> War pictures accounted for 13% of the works seen at the New English Art Club exhibition in October 1941, and about 6% of those at the Second United Artists' Exhibition (although the latter was intended for the timely purpose of raising money for the Duke of Gloucester's Red Cross and St. John Fund) in 1942. Even an exhibition that pointedly took contemporary events as its theme, the England in Wartime group show at the Leicester Galleries, was described (by Mass-Observation) as being totally without successful war pictures but with several excellent paintings "only remotely connected with the war." Similarly (according to a journalist writing later about the Art in Wartime show at the Bluecoat Gallery, Liverpool, "If one may judge by this exhibition, ... [artists] were far more excited by the deep snowfall last February than in anything that has happened since. Snowdrifts and still life, white sails and washing on a line, flower pieces and farms!"<sup>77</sup> The executive of even the Artists' International Association was probably somewhat surprised when, in response to a request to its members for their reactions to war subjects in art, the general opinion seemed to be "in favour of exhibitions covering the field of art as a whole rather than those of a topical nature."<sup>78</sup> Nor were artists without the support of critics on this issue. The Burlington Magazine was not taking an unusual position when it praised a peace-oriented exhibition at Sotheby's in January 1940 because "the greater the nervous tension, the greater the

need for the quiet pleasures of painting."<sup>79</sup> In 1943 The Daily Mail commented on the brisk market for still lifes and landscapes rather than war pictures, and suggested that "painters and the public at large have rushed to capture a memory of what they feared to lose."<sup>80</sup>

However, most available analyses of critical and/or popular reactions are based on exhibitions held either at commercial galleries or by exhibiting societies, where everything on display was intended for sale. Unwillingness to purchase pictures of war subjects cannot be equated with unwillingness to look at them; it may rather indicate an awareness that the pictures would be likely to lose their interest when they ceased to be topical. (It is also potentially misleading to equate the interests and expectations of cinema audiences with those of gallery visitors. The two types of events usually not only entailed different amounts of viewing time, but could also be considered to be essentially different as leisure pursuits. For many gallery visitors, exhibitions were "work," whereas the cinema was more broadly defined as a means of escape from the pressures of daily life in wartime.) People seem to have distinguished between exhibitions in which war art was intended to be a prominent feature (such as the WAAC shows), and those in which this was not the case. The presence of topical imagery in exhibitions that were not intended to be concerned with the war as a theme was (as noted above) often unwelcome, whereas those who visited showings of war art were

expecting to see war imagery. This suggests not a blanket lack of interest in war themes in art, but rather an attempt to compartmentalise the War - to acknowledge it as a fact of great contemporary importance and interest without allowing it to dominate life entirely. Certainly interest in the WAAC's exhibitions was high throughout the country,<sup>5</sup> while exhibitions staged by such groups as the Civil Defence Artists, the Firemen Artists and the Barrage Balloon Artists achieved quite uniformly high attendance levels and critical praise.<sup>81</sup>

It is with these considerations in mind that one should propose an analysis of the impact of the WAAC exhibitions. The fact that their popularity was out of step with general attitudes towards the War as a theme in entertainment implies that, as a vehicle of subtle pro-British propaganda, their existence was significant; and (as will be seen) the fact that their expression of this pro-British viewpoint was made through "high art" media probably accounted for much of this effectiveness.

By the spring of 1940 the War Artists' Advisory Committee had accumulated several hundred works, all acquired with public money and under the auspices of a Ministry that was voicing increasingly frequent misgivings about the value of war art. Especially as large numbers of books were not forthcoming, the WAAC needed to make some sort of public justification

---

<sup>5</sup> See attendance figures in Appendix 4.

of its existence and, with art galleries stripped of their permanent collections, the exhibiting of the war art collection became inevitable. The Trustees of the National Gallery were approached, and happily gave their consent for the first display of official Second World War art to be opened there in July 1940. The show included a cross-section of what the WAAC considered its most visually impressive works, with representations of as many aspects of the War and wartime life as possible. The display was closed briefly following damage suffered by the Gallery in two air raids in October 1940,<sup>82</sup> but otherwise remained open throughout the War. New works were added every few months. Emphasis was placed upon obtaining as much publicity as possible through press views, opening night parties, the preparation (for reporters) of written summaries of the works, and follow-up letters soliciting reviews and the publication of reproductions.<sup>83</sup> As a result of these efforts press reaction to the exhibitions was extensive during the first half of the War, although it decreased significantly during the second half.

The WAAC had reason to suppose that war art exhibitions would be popular. During the First World War displays of such pictures had been extremely well-attended in both London and the counties.<sup>84</sup> In addition, the national art collections in London had evacuated all or most of their holdings in 1939. The Wallace Collection and the Tate Gallery were to remain closed until after VE Day, the National Portrait Gallery re-



opened some rooms in June 1942 and again in February 1943, and the National Maritime Museum and the Imperial War Museum were open at erratic intervals and with restricted hours. The magnificent collection of the National Gallery itself was sent to caves near Aberystwyth and, with the rare exceptions of a very few individual works, remained there until the spring of 1945. The WAAC therefore assumed that a demand was building for the opportunity to see art in a museum setting. This assumption was later validated by (inter alia) the phenomenal popularity of the "Picture of the Month" exhibitions in which single paintings were retrieved from Aberystwyth for display at the National Gallery. Queues to see each month's painting stretched down the Gallery steps and into Trafalgar Square.

Immediately after the July 1940 opening of the first war art exhibition at the National Gallery some four hundred illustrated guide booklets were sold in a single day.<sup>85</sup> Attendance figures, however, were not kept by the Gallery at any point over the next five years, and only ten head counts, conducted by Mass-Observation workers in 1940 and 1941, and showing an average of approximately fifty-two people in the exhibition at any given time, are extant.<sup>86</sup> On a more general and impressionistic level, newspaper reviews repeatedly commented on the popularity of the show, which even during the Blitz was "very successful."<sup>87</sup> As it became better-known it attracted larger audiences, resulting in the decision to open the Gallery on Sunday afternoons beginning in 1941.<sup>88</sup> During the latter half

of 1943 crowds were, by the WAAC's reckoning, positively thronging the Gallery, especially in the afternoons and on bank holidays, and the popularity of the exhibition was believed to be even greater than it had been in 1942.<sup>89</sup>

In addition, the generally enthusiastic response of the press was typified by the reviews quoted near the beginning of this chapter. Reviewers often praised precisely those works that seemed to be the most implicitly distanced from traditional propaganda, and were also strongly impressed by what was almost unfailingly interpreted as the WAAC's very British (and very un-German) catholicity of taste. In 1941, for example, a reviewer was sufficiently impressed with the range of styles on exhibition that he referred to the exhibition as "one of the most important single events that has happened in British art for three-quarters of a century."<sup>90</sup> Reviewers rarely employed the word "propaganda" in connection with the works, as if by agreement that to evaluate the effectiveness of a work as propaganda would demean it or rob it of its value, even when the work had an obvious morale-boosting effect on the viewer. "Not one artist waves a flag or makes a boast," wrote The Daily Herald's art critic in 1942; "Yet you come away refreshed and reassured, confident in the future of [... the British] race...."<sup>91</sup> Pro-propaganda critics did admire the portraits by Eric Kennington (probably, as a group,

the most unabashedly propagandist items acquired by the WAAC;<sup>6</sup> illustration 4), claiming that the portraits were "unmistakably virile studies of men, striking in force of character, presented in a manner that makes them visibly representative of the times in which we live."<sup>92</sup> (Similarly, according to an unabashedly propagandist catalogue for a display of war art destined for the West Indies, Kennington's portraits showed "Manhood, quick and sure," and captured "all the fine traditions of the Empire Navy and the empire Seamen."<sup>93</sup>) Yet it is significant that these portraits were also the pictures most likely to be criticised for the lack of subtlety that proclaimed their shrill propagandist roots. Eric Newton called them "strident things whose assertiveness almost hurts one's eyes,"<sup>94</sup> while an anonymous reviewer in New Statesman and Nation wrote, "I cannot believe that these young heroes look so intense and neurotic, and the violence of Mr. Kennington's style seems to me as hysterical as the eloquence of Hitler."<sup>95</sup> A columnist with The Lancet proposed a theory of his/her own to account for the appearance of the artist's portrait subjects: "...In real life the male only wears that look of

---

<sup>6</sup> Kennington eventually refused to continue working for the Committee, primarily because of what he thought was its failure to exploit its war art as propaganda (Kennington to Lord Wiloughby de Broke (Air Ministry), 20 September 1942 (GP/55/1(B), p.63). Kennington also disagreed that the war art exhibitions made useful contributions to propaganda. "I think their gallery Exhibitions are O.K. but not enough," he wrote in 1942. ".... The gallery shows to .01 per cent of the people & those not the right ones" (Kennington to G. Elmslie Owen, 28 September 1942 (GP/72/ F(2), p.155).

clear-eyed hunger for the Good, the True, and the Beautiful when one of his physical appetites is being denied; Kennington probably waits until they want their dinner...."<sup>96</sup>

The popularity of the ongoing National Gallery exhibition may be used to gauge the potential value of war art as a form of pro-British propaganda; but the clearest indication of the ability of the WAAC's art to align public opinion with the government is to be seen in its organisation of exhibitions in the provinces. An understanding of the impact that the Committee expected its art collection to have outside of London in particular is inextricably linked with an examination of attitudes towards art in the provinces, and specifically with views on the "cultural condition" of the counties compared with that of the capital.

During the First World War notice had been taken by the Ministry of Information of the propaganda value of exhibiting war art in the provinces.<sup>97</sup> This evaluation had been based upon the difference that existed between the Armed Forces' war on the continent and the comparative safety of life in Britain itself. This split was not paralleled during the Second World War. In 1940-1945 the front line was as much in Britain as anywhere else, and the need to keep the War ever-present in the home population's consciousness by means of art exhibitions, for example, was not an important consideration for the WAAC. In fact, the Committee had originally expected to hold

only large mixed exhibitions at the Royal Academy or the National Gallery, and small shows in well-known commercial galleries in London.<sup>98</sup> However, this plan was changed shortly after the National Gallery exhibition first opened, at which time the decision was made to begin sending art on provincial tours.

One politic reason for this change of plans was the growing resentment outside of the large cities (London in particular) over issues of economic and cultural imbalance. An analysis of local government organisation in 1931 had concluded that the most obvious defect in the system as it existed in England was the almost complete neglect by the municipalities of the cultural elements in social life.<sup>99</sup> At the beginning of the decade London and the wealthy home counties accounted for one-third of the work force, but 71.7% of the artists. In Wales the resident percentage of the work force was more than three and one-half times the percentage of artists (5.9% and 1.6%). The corresponding figures for eastern England were 4.2% and 1.6%; those for northern England were 34.5% and 9.0%.<sup>100</sup> Analogously, London was the site of most of the country's national art collections, all of them dependent upon public monies. According to the British Institute of Adult Education and other sources, the taxpaying population outside London was six times that of the capital, and attendance at provincial exhibitions outnumbered attendance in London by a factor of approximately seven to four. Yet many local museums were main-

tained entirely on municipal rates rather than national funding. It was also estimated that in the second half of the 1930's there were between about 100 and 120 art galleries ("including several so poorly stocked as to be negligible") in all of England and Wales, while the number of towns with populations of 5000 or more was approximately 480.<sup>101</sup> 1938 statistics indicated that all funding for the provincial art collections amounted to only £450,000 per year.<sup>102</sup>

The situation was worsened when many towns closed their museums and galleries at the outbreak of war, or saw them requisitioned by military authorities. In April 1940 more than 20% of museums and art galleries in Britain had been closed since September 1939.<sup>103</sup> The Victoria and Albert Museum was the only national institution that had a regular programme of circulating exhibitions to the provinces (41,015 works of art - none of them oil paintings - in 1937),<sup>104</sup> and the extent of even this was cut severely after September 1939. As a result, the need to address the longstanding imbalance between London and the counties took on a new urgency. It was augmented by the flood of refugees, civil servants and businesses out of London and into more rural areas, and soon became a popular topic of attention for journalists and critics. An author writing in 1940, for example, did some simple calculations: "The national bookkeeping may ... be summarised roughly as follows: - the provinces maintain their own art galleries and also maintain five-sixths of the London galleries: in return

London does for the provinces almost exactly nothing."<sup>105</sup> Eric Newton deplored the fact that in the 1930's "60 per cent. of the art worth seeing in these islands ... and 90 per cent. of the money spent on works of art" was confined to a one-square-mile area in London. "...The cultural gap between London and the smaller provincial towns," he wrote, "is far greater in the visual than in any of the other arts."<sup>106</sup>

Under these circumstances the need arose to provide forms of organised entertainment on a scale hitherto unknown in many areas. By mid-1940 the war art collection was growing quickly enough to be able to furnish more than one exhibition, and there was no danger of provincial towns and cities being forced to make do with work that was not considered good enough for showing in London. By the end of that year arrangements had been completed for the circulation of the first of several exhibitions.

The very fact that these exhibitions came into existence at all under the auspices of the Ministry of Information could be (and was) interpreted as evidence that the government was taking an active interest in the welfare of the provinces. The exhibitions thus encouraged the wartime ideal of national unity. In this regard the warlikeness of the subjects depicted in the art was comparatively unimportant. This is a central factor to consider in any attempt to explain why the exhibitions were so popular while the reproductions of war art were not. It is also important to recall that, by 1940, the expectation

that efforts should be made to enrich the cultural life of the provinces had been reinforced by the work of a variety of organisations. In 1931, for example, the Leisure Society had announced its intention "to preach a wider and richer use of leisure; and to this end to encourage all art, research, scholarship, travel, crafts and sport."<sup>107</sup> In 1936 the newly-founded League of Audiences had declared similar intentions on the grounds that "cultural recreation needs stimulus and direction."<sup>108</sup> The Art Exhibitions Bureau organised travelling exhibitions as a private enterprise. Schools were the principal recipients of touring displays of works from the Manchester City Art Gallery's Rutherford Loan Scheme collection. In the latter half of the 1930's and during the War the Artists' International Association was involved in sending contemporary art to galleries, youth centres, RAF stations, churches, British Restaurants and other sites, while the Museums Association circulated art shows to museums and galleries located in cities or large towns. Also important (beginning in 1935) were the British Institute of Adult Education's Art for the People exhibitions, organised "to cultivate popular interest" in art.<sup>109</sup> In the approximately three and one-half weeks in 1935 that the BIAE's first three exhibitions were open (in two towns and one village with a combined population of less than 150,000), they were seen by 5000 children and more than 10,000 adults.

The WAAC facilitated the circulation of its nine exhi-



bitions of war art in the provinces by placing four of them under the administrative jurisdiction of the BIAE, and the remaining five under that of the Museums Association. The latter continued its peacetime practice of favouring larger art institutions, and the BIAE in turn perpetuated its pre-war emphasis on informal settings in more rural areas.<sup>7</sup> The latter venues were particularly important because, as a survey of viewers at MoI exhibitions outside of London in 1941 revealed, people who did not have a history of interest in "high-brow" culture were often too intimidated by museums to go into them at all.<sup>110</sup> If two of Kenneth Clark's reasons for becoming involved in the government's wartime art projects had been to raise the level of popular taste and to convince residents of non-urban Britain that their lives and interests were as important to the government as those of their fellow-citizens in London, the example of the BIAE could not be ignored. As was the case with the shows it had organised since 1935, the BIAE ensured that each of the collections that it circulated for the WAAC was accompanied by guide-lecturers who were responsible for answering visitors' questions and for facilitating interest in individual exhibits.

Public willingness to approach the exhibitions with an open mind was also facilitated by the fact that the Museums Association and the BIAE were known to be concerned primarily with the aesthetic, entertainment and education value of exhi-

---

<sup>7</sup> See Appendix 4.

bitions. These purposes were emphasised in the catalogues and brochures (all prepared by the WAAC), which tended to emphasise the importance of approaching the individual works as examples of fine art. Eric Newton, for example, in the catalogue that accompanied the first of the five shows toured by the Museums Association, insisted upon two principal themes: the value of state patronage for the production of a vibrant record of the War, and the qualitative differences between the supposedly objective truthfulness of photographs and the interpretive, subjective truthfulness of paintings and drawings.<sup>111</sup> Jan Gordon, in his introduction to the catalogue for the first exhibition circulated by the BIAE, stated that war artists should avoid the making of "actual" (i.e., uninterpretive, unstructured) records, in favour of "impactual" ones.<sup>112</sup> Absent from his text were stirring descriptions of the personalities and events depicted in the art, or pleas to the reader to support the war effort with greater vigour.

To the gratification of both the WAAC and the MoI, the touring exhibitions of war art provoked the same interest and enthusiasm that greeted most other exhibitions in the counties during the War. (Museums and art galleries in Bristol, Leeds, Manchester, Leicester and other cities set attendance records at various points in 1940-1945.<sup>113</sup>) The first of the shows toured by the Museums Association visited eighteen towns and cities between the end of 1940 and the late summer of 1942. Demand was so great<sup>114</sup> that a second collection of war art was

put into circulation in 1941-1942, again under the auspices of the Association. When the first two shows were recalled to London in 1942 they were replaced by a fresh pair (1943-1944), which were in turn succeeded by a fifth and final show toured by the Association in 1944-1945. Some 9000 people saw the first of them when it visited Newcastle for eighteen days in 1941. The same number saw the second over a three-week period in Sunderland that same year.<sup>8</sup> Between them these five collections made sixty-five stops in forty-one centres. Press reaction was almost unerringly favourable. The Aberdeen Press and Journal, for example, considered the first selection to be "one of the most fascinating" shows ever held at the Aberdeen Art Gallery.<sup>115</sup>

The BIAE made some seventy-five to eighty bookings for its four exhibitions of war art from 1941 to 1944, with only seven centres receiving more than one show. Attendance was almost uniformly impressive, ranging from 16,615 in Leicester (forty-two days in 1942) to 11,500 in Colchester (twenty-nine days in 1941), 3393 in Merthyr Tydfil (fifteen days in 1943), 1200 in Bulford (six days in 1942), and down to 200 or less (when the showing was for only a few days, in very small towns or on RAF or military bases). More than 4000 people living in and around Redditch attended an exhibition there during its thirteen-day run in 1943, while a remarkable total of 12,000 visitors was counted in fourteen days in 1942 when the third

---

<sup>8</sup> See Appendix 4.

of the four BIAE exhibitions was shown at the Corn Exchange in Braintree.

Unlike the First World War Ministry of Information, the new MoI was responsible for the promotion of pro-British sympathy abroad, and therefore had a legitimate interest in the promotion of war art exhibitions in other countries. The Ministry found itself with a virtual monopoly on foreign exhibitions on the theme of the War, the British Council having agreed in 1939 to restrict its own activities to non-war subjects.<sup>116</sup>

Britain at War, the first show of original war art to be sent abroad,<sup>9</sup> opened at the Museum of Modern Art in New York on 23 May 1941. It included, in addition to 110 works acquired by the WAAC, some photographs, examples of camouflage technique, a few paintings by Canadian artists, and watercolours from the First World War. Care had also been taken, when selecting the pictures, to include a few showing Allied servicemen, some of these paintings having been commissioned especially for the exhibition.<sup>117</sup>

Britain at War was organised in response to pressure from the MoI for projects that would be useful in nudging America out of neutrality, and was therefore conceived purely as an

---

<sup>9</sup> The first exhibition of WAAC images sent abroad had actually been sent to Tokyo in 1940, but had consisted entirely of black-and-white photographs rather than the artworks themselves.

exercise in pro-British propaganda.<sup>118</sup> In this regard an immediate problem, from the MoI's standpoint, seemed to be the necessarily heavy reliance upon pictures produced during the Phoney War, few of which took battle as their theme. This, to the minds of several Ministry employees, risked suggesting to Americans that Britain did not require assistance, and that the War was not a particularly urgent affair. However, from the standpoint of Clark and other members of the WAAC, this apparent shortcoming presented an ideal opportunity to engage in exactly the sort of non-belligerent propaganda work that they tended to favour. In his catalogue essay Herbert Read explained away the lack of battle pictures:

It must ... be remembered though the English are energetic in action, they are restrained in expression. Our typical poetry is lyrical, not epical or even tragic. Our typical music is the madrigal and the song, not the opera and the symphony. Our typical painting is the landscape. In all these respects war cannot change us, and we are fighting this war precisely because in these respects we refuse to be changed.<sup>119</sup>

As John Rothenstein reported following his own wartime visit to the United States, the Americans whom he had met seemed to feel revulsion when confronted with blatant war propaganda.<sup>120</sup> The same conclusion motivated the style of the wartime radio broadcasts of Edward R. Murrow, the American journalist whose nightly This is London broadcasts to the United States were studiously calm and unpolemical in keeping with his dictum,

"Just provide the honest news...."<sup>121</sup>

Despite its dismissal of battle paintings as subjects for British war art, Read's brief catalogue text was intended to attack anti-war sentiment in America. He refused to allow his readers to assume that the absence of all but a few action pictures implied that the War did not constitute a pressing emergency, and instead reminded them that even in a barbarous conflict the British remained high-minded. National self-effacement - not a lack of urgency - accounted for the dominant character of the work. Lest the point should be missed Lord Halifax (the British Ambassador to the United States) restated it when he opened the exhibition, describing the show as "[a record of] that calm and determined resolution with which the ordinary folk of Britain are meeting the varying hazards of this most grim war."<sup>122</sup> Some 3000 people visited Britain at War on its opening day alone, and press reviews were enthusiastic.<sup>123</sup>

By mid-June, however, the Museum of Modern Art had confirmed a booking of the comparatively expensive exhibition with only one other American institution (the Baltimore Museum), whereas it required at least five bookings in order to avoid financial losses.<sup>124</sup> Under these conditions a Canadian tour, if one could be arranged, seemed an attractive alternative.<sup>125</sup> Clark disapproved, believing that an entirely different show, with substantially greater Canadian content, would be better-received in Canada.<sup>126</sup> (In any case Canada was

already at war, and therefore not in urgent need of incentives to take an interest in British affairs.) Clark was over-ruled. Fourteen WAAC portraits of Canadians, and pictures of events in which Canadians had participated, were consequently sent from London in 1941 (after approval by the MoI's Overseas Planning Committee, which wished to ensure their value as propaganda), to join Britain at War at showings in Ottawa, Toronto and Montreal.<sup>127</sup> In February 1942 the collection, too large to be accommodated at smaller institutions, was split up. Several of the paintings were seen at London (Ontario), while the remainder went to the Buhl Planetarium and Institute in Pittsburgh. All the works were reunited at San Francisco's Palace of the Legion of Honour in the spring of 1942.<sup>128</sup>

Britain at War maintained during this tour the same popularity that it had enjoyed in New York in 1941. During its first weekend in Ottawa the show was visited by 3000 people (a record total for the National Gallery of Canada), and at the end of its three-week run there it was thought to have set an attendance record for a single exhibition.<sup>129</sup> Nor were Canadian reviewers any more immune than their New York counterparts had been to the veiled propagandist intent behind the exhibition. Substantial press coverage was given to British High Commissioner Malcolm MacDonald's statement (made at the opening of the show in Ottawa) that Germany was attempting to destroy civilisation, "one precious part of which is the freedom of sensitive, creative artists to express themselves in

whatever forms they like."<sup>130</sup> A Toronto critic confessed himself "surprised and pleasantly stunned" to discover that most or all of the pictures were as interesting for their artistic merit as for their subject matter.<sup>131</sup> In a similar vein, Montreal's leading anglophone critic admired the art of Paul Nash, Henry Moore and Graham Sutherland "in terms of pure aesthetics, with no overtones of patriotism or idealism." He argued that their pictures failed "to ennoble a theme of great desperation and heroism, to give a dramatic report of an historic event, and to stir the imagination and stimulate the pride of the people"; yet his review tellingly concluded,

You will not, I trust, assume from the foregoing that the exhibition failed to impress me. It did impress me, and all the more because of its reticence. Turning artists into out-and-out reporters and propagandists is not the British way.<sup>132</sup>

The same opinion was voiced in another Montreal summary of the central thesis of Britain at War: "The show is proof of the British government's admirable determination that Art - as part of the civilisation for which we are fighting - shall not be a war casualty."<sup>133</sup>

Britain at War was subsequently sent to Central and South America as a replacement for an exhibition of 111 war pictures that had been sunk en route to Rio de Janeiro in 1942. (This had been, and remained, the largest single loss of WAAC works, and had put an end to the shipment abroad of large exhibitions.) The MoI's Latin American Division was adamant that the



lost show would have been invaluable as propaganda,<sup>134</sup> and was therefore relieved to be able to replace it with Britain at War. The latter did not include any pictures targeted specifically at a Latin American audience or intended to whip up violent pro-war reactions, and thus further vindicated the WAAC's faith in the value of understated propaganda when it enjoyed as successful a tour in Central and South America as it had in the United States and Canada.<sup>135</sup>

The other three dominions also received displays of war art. In these cases, however, the MoI took a more heavy-handed approach to promotion and organisation than it had with Britain at War. The catalogues for the shows, the texts for most of which were prepared by the relevant departments of the MoI, were more propagandistically patriotic in tone. India in Action, consisting of fifty-one drawings produced by Anthony Gross in 1941-1943 and showing Indian forces in the Middle East and in eastern India, was sent abroad only at the instigation of the India Office (1944), visiting Melbourne, Adelaide, Sydney, Dunedin, Christchurch, Wellington and Auckland before arriving in America in the spring of 1945.<sup>136</sup> A selection of WAAC works had already been seen in Australia and New Zealand in 1942-1943, but India in Action was considered more important by the India Office because the British war effort in South-East Asia Command was thought to be undervalued by other Allied forces operating in the area. "The imminence of major action in Burma would make it good propaganda to direct

Australia's attention by all methods, to the heroism and endurance of the UK troops on that Front," wrote a Ministry official in February 1944. "One excellent method at our disposal is the set of drawings by Anthony Gross...."<sup>137</sup> The same sentiments were expressed in the speeches given at each opening of the show.<sup>138</sup>

Collections of war art were also dispatched to the Caribbean, South America and Latin America. The British Council had commented in 1940 on the particular value of art exhibitions as agents of propaganda in the West Indies, where the people "possess a great measure of natural art and artistic appreciation," and where "a little recognition [...of the West Indies' part in the War] would mean very much more than the size or importance of [...an] exhibition would indicate."<sup>139</sup> The MoI, concerned about political unrest in the West Indies, came to a similar conclusion. Clark (May 1941) objected ("...I do not like the idea of dissipating our forces in a number of small groups of pictures which I fear would be ineffective, and I doubt if we can spare a larger exhibition for the West Indies"<sup>140</sup>), but the MoI cited the potential propaganda value and Clark conceded the point. The unsubtle catalogue essay, by H.D. Molesworth, reflected the Ministry's concerns, with liberal references to Manhood, Country and God.<sup>141</sup> Unfortunately, after it left London, the exhibition was unable to reach the West Indies, went to Bermuda instead, and remained there until the end of the War.<sup>142</sup>

Thus, in terms of effectiveness as propaganda the WAAC's greatest contribution was made - in various ways - through its exhibitions in London, elsewhere in Britain, and abroad. The MoI was obliged to admit that, even if official war art was not propagandist in an obvious sense, its exhibition certainly provoked substantial public and critical interest and approbation. A collection of some one hundred pictures sent to South Africa in 1944 proved so popular that, although originally intended to be on tour for six months, it was returned to Britain only at the end of 1947.<sup>143</sup> It is significant that war art shows were anticipated to be ineffective only in the Soviet Union, where such art was expected to be avowedly propagandist in appearance. A proposed 1942 exhibition for the USSR was cancelled for reasons related to an observation that the pictures seemed to suggest that Britain was "a very bourgeois country putting itself out to only a moderate extent." Similarly, in 1943 Kenneth Clark dissuaded the British Council from organising for the Soviet Union an exhibition that would not take the War as its theme. On that occasion he argued that although such a show would attract favourable attention elsewhere, it would provoke little interest in the USSR.<sup>144</sup>

The validity of the WAAC's repeatedly-argued assertion that war art would have its greatest impact if the works selected for inclusion met certain standards of aesthetic acceptability was proved not only by the critical and popular suc-

cess enjoyed by the many collections to which this criterion was applied, but also by the reaction accorded to the only one of the shows about which the Committee had severe doubts: The War at Sea (illustration 21). Having purchased (in 1941) a single picture by Norman Wilkinson, in 1944 the Committee became the reluctant recipient of a gift of fifty-six of the artist's large oil paintings recording the work of the Royal and Merchant Navies. Fifty-two of the paintings were exhibited at the National Gallery in September 1944, and left England in February 1945 for a tour of Australia, Tasmania (Hobart and Launceston) and, beginning in November 1946, New Zealand (Dunedin, Christchurch, Wellington and Auckland).<sup>145</sup>

As Wilkinson pointed out proudly in his catalogue essay, his work ignored aesthetic artifice and invention.<sup>146</sup> His paintings were compositionally tame and monotonous in colour, and these qualities were not improved by the large sizes of the individual works. This was precisely what disturbed not only Clark and his colleagues, but also newspaper critics in Australia, Tasmania and New Zealand who had reacted favourably to the two earlier exhibitions of war art seen in those places. "It is almost unbelievable that Mr. Wilkinson should have remained blind and deaf to any single one of the means used to vitalize a picture," wrote a New Zealand journalist who did not find The War at Sea even mildly inspiring.<sup>147</sup> The Ministry of Information appears to have pinned its hopes on the fact that Wilkinson focused on the sorts of dramatic

events that constituted such a small part of the war art collection as a whole: the attacks on the Bismarck, the Scharnhorst, the Gniesenau and the Tirpitz, the battles of Narvik, Matapan and Pearl Harbour, aircraft attacking ships, and so on. It soon realised (by comparing the tone of critical reaction to The War at Sea with that which had greeted the WAAC's less overtly pro-war exhibitions both at home and abroad) that for art to succeed as propaganda it needed to be perceived in terms of its aesthetic interest and especially as a form of expression that was, at root, incompatible with belligerence. "Academic and aesthetic considerations are of no account except in so far as they serve the perilous human adventure which now engulfs us all," a hostile critic had complained in 1942. "Pictures, whatever the connoisseurs like, must in these days move the masses."<sup>148</sup> The WAAC proved that, in wartime, the value of art was more in its medium than in its content.

#### Chapter 4: Endnotes

1. Cyril Radcliffe (Director- General, MoI) to Deputy Director-General, MoI, 15 June 1943 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/143).

2. They were thinking in particular of Eric Kennington and William Roberts; see the Minutes of the 23 November 1939 meeting.

3. Anonymous, "British Art and Life To-Day," Britain To-day, #16 (8 December 1939), p.3.

4. For a general discussion of the Ministry's approach to morale, see Ian McLaine, Ministry of Morale: Home Front Morale and the Ministry of Information in World War II (London/Boston/ Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1979), pp.7-10, 118-121. The Ministry also seems not to have given much attention to defining the concept of "morale." As a spokesman for the Air Ministry noted, until at least the second half of 1941 "there was hardly any consideration of what exactly was meant by the term" (Charles Webster and Noble Frankland, The Strategic Air Offensive Against Germany, 1939-1945, Vol. 1 (series: History of the Second World War. United Kingdom Military Services, J.R.M. Butler, ed.), (London: HMSO and Longmans, Green and Co, 1961), p.297). For background on the notion of art as a propaganda tool, see: A.P. Foulkes, Literature and Propaganda (London/New York: Methuen, 1983), p.6; James A. Leith, The Idea of Art as Propaganda in France, 1750-1799: A Study in the History of Ideas (University of Toronto Romance Series, #8) (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), especially pp.13-14, 141-155; and Steve Neale, "Propaganda," Screen, 18 #3 (Autumn 1977), pp.9-40.

5. Beaton described his employment by the Ministry in two volumes of his autobiography: The Years Between: Diaries, 1939-44 (1965), and The Happy Years: Diaries, 1944-48 (1972) (both, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson). The six books of photographs were: (1) History Under Fire: 52 Photographs of Air Raid Damage to London Buildings, 1940-41 (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1941); (2) Air of Glory: A Wartime Scrapbook (London: HMSO, 1941); (3) Far East Scrapbook (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1945); (4) Winged Squadron (London/New York/Melbourne: Hutchinson & Co. Ltd, 1942); (5) Chinese Album (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1945-1946); and (6) Indian Album (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1945-1946). See also Peter Quennell and Gail Buckland, Cecil Beaton: War Photographs 1939-45 (London: Jane's Publishing Company Ltd, for the Imperial War Museum, 1981), pp.14, 24, 28.

6. John Piper, "Art: New War Pictures," Spectator, 165 #5854 (6 September 1940), p.242; R.P. Gossop, "War in Pictures: Opportunity Missed? [letter to the Editor]," Times (8 July 1940), p.4).

7. Minutes of the 26 March 1941 meeting.

8. Minutes of the 21 May 1941 meeting.

9. For example: Arnold Palmer to Christopher Perkins (artist), 29 July 1942 (GP/55/200); and M.W. Murdoch (MoHS) to J.D. Jamieson (Office of the Regional Civil Defence Commissioner, Birmingham), 2 February 1944 (MoHS (in PRO): HO 186/1649).

10. WAAC, "Interim Report for the Third Year of the War" (August 1942), pp.4,5 (GP/46/B).

11. Ministry of National Service to Alfred Yockney (Wellington House), 21 January 1918 (IWM: G4010/27); Meirion and Susie Harries, The War Artists: British Official War Art of the Twentieth Century (London: Michael Joseph, in association with the Imperial War Museum and the Tate Gallery, 1983), pp.74-78.

12. For example: Minutes of the 29 November 1939 meeting.

13. International Propaganda and Broadcasting Inquiry, Memorandum [to MoI] by the International Propaganda and Broadcasting Inquiry (21 June 1939) (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/724).

14. Parliamentary Debates (Lords), 114, column 1220 (3 October 1939).

15. MoI (in PRO): INF 1/260.

16. Kenneth Clark to W.G.V. Vaughan (MoI), 29 August 1940 (GP/55/1(A), p.120).

17. Kenneth Clark, "Art for the People," Listener, 22 #567 (23 November 1939), pp.999-1001.

18. Ian McLaine, Ministry of Morale, op.cit., pp.150-152. Similarly the Foreign Office, for example, made a point of agreeing with Desmond MacCarthy (of New Statesman and Nation) that for the magazine even to consider not publishing a pacifist letter by George Bernard Shaw would ultimately be counterproductive because it would seem too much like the actions of the Fascist nations; see John Lehmann, I Am My Brother: Autobiography II (London: Longmans, Green and Co Ltd, 1960), pp.29-31.

19. Anonymous, "Art in War-time," Times (11 October 1939), p.9.

20. J.B. Nicholas, "Is British Art Fighting?," Art & Industry, 232 #191 (May 1942), p.124.

21. Herbert Read, "Is British Art Fighting? A Reply by Herbert Read," Art & Industry, 33 #193 (July 1942), pp.3-4.

22. Kenneth Clark, "The Artist in Wartime," Listener, 22 #563 (26 October 1939), p.810.

23. Graham Bell, The Artist and His Public (series: Hogarth Sixpenny Pamphlets, #5) (London: The Hogarth Press, 1939), p.5. In this publication Bell was concerned specifically with internal threats to British art, rather than with British-German cultural differences. The role of poetry in the definition of national character is noted in Neil Sutherland, The Political and Personal Response to War Experience in British Poetry 1939-1945 (D. Phil. thesis, Lincoln College, University of Oxford, 1977), pp.359-361.

24. Eric Newton, "Paul Nash's War Paintings," Sunday Times (1 September 1940), p.2.

25. Pierre Bourdieu's notion of the habitus is especially relevant to considerations of this sort.

26. For example: Graham Bell, "Art in the 'Island Fortress': A Review of Contemporary British Painting," Studio, 120 #571 (October 1941), pp.98-109.

27. For example: Kenneth Clark, "War Artists at the National Gallery," Studio, 123 #586 (January 1942), pp.2-9; and MoI [WAAC], "New War Paintings by British Artists," [MoI] Clip-Sheet (for press release), #126 (3 June 1942), n.p.

28. Eric Newton, "The Poetry of War: Fine Achievement of Modern Painters," Sunday Times, 29 December 1940, p.10.

29. Art Critic [Keith Vaughan], "War Artists and the War," Penguin New Writing #16 (March 1943), pp.114-116.

30. For example: Nikolaus Pevsner, "The Truth of the Shelters: Shelter Sketch Book, by Henry Moore," Architectural Review, 98 #587 (November 1945), p.147.

31. GP/46/57.

32. Harries and Harries, The War Artists, op.cit., p.268.



33. Among other books extensively illustrated with war art, but not published at the instigation of the WAAC, were Edward Ardizzone's Baggage to the Enemy (John Murray, 1941) about his work as a war artist in 1940 in France; The Abyssinian Campaign: The Official Story of the Conquest of Italian East Africa (HMSO, c.1942; illustrated with drawings made by Edward Bawden in North Africa); Feliks Topolski and James Laver's Britain in Peace and War (Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1941); Topolski's Russia in War: London - Summer - 1941; Russia-Bound Convoy; A British Cruiser; Iceland (Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1942); Joseph Bato's Defiant City (Victor Gollancz Ltd, 1942; scenes of London during the Blitz), Edward Seago's High Endeavour (Collins, 1944); Seago's With the Allied Armies in Italy (Collins, 1945); and a selection from Henry Moore's shelter sketchbooks (Editions Poetry London, 1944).

34. Minutes of the 14 February 1940 meeting. See also the relevant correspondence is in GP/46/10(A) and GP/46/10(B), and Kenneth Clark to E.M.O'R. Dickey [March 1940] (GP/46/20).

35. Minutes of the 29 November 1939 meeting.

36. Minutes of the 14 and 20 February, and the 10 April 1940 meetings.

37. The restrictions need not have been a death blow because, under pressure from the MoI, the Treasury conceded, "...We would not oppose such reproduction for sale in America and other foreign markets where a ready demand might be expected, or (in a form not too blatantly 'de luxe') for sale in this country when either the Service interest was predominant or the primary purpose was to sell in America and the home edition was secondary..." (J.A. Barlow (Treasury) to N.G. Scorgie (MoI), 19 August 1940 (GP/46/B)).

38. These included: several one-shilling books to be devoted to specific subjects covered by the war art collection; a book on Bomber Command featuring pictures by Eric Kennington, Paul Nash, William Rothenstein and others; a book on the theme of airplanes, to be written and illustrated by Nash; a series of books with colour reproductions to sell at 3/6; a large Christmas book with a projected sale price of 7/6; and an RAF book to retail at the comparatively high price of either 7/6 or 10/-. See: Minutes of the 10 October 1940 and 12 February 1941 meetings; memorandum (21 April 1941) (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/124); Harald Peake to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 14 February 1941 (GP/72/E(1), p.12).

39. Kenneth Clark to Allen Lane (Penguin Books), 7 January 1941 (GP/46/36).

40. For example: anonymous, "The War: British War Pictures," Times Literary Supplement, #2103 (23 May 1942), p.255; Guy Pocock, "Notes on Books: War Pictures by British Artists," Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, 92 #4668 (23 June 1944), p.388.

41. H.W. Richmond, "Introduction," in Oxford University Press, War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 1. War at Sea (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942), pp.5-10.

42. H.E. Bates, "Introduction," in Oxford University Press, War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 3. R.A.F. (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942), pp.5-7.

43. Colin Coote, "Introduction," in Oxford University Press, War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 4. Army, (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942), p.5.

44. J.B. Morton, "Introduction," in Oxford University Press, War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 2. Blitz (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942), p.5.

45. Penelope Curtis, World War Two: A Display of Pictures from the Collection to Mark the 50th Anniversary of the Outbreak of War in September 1939 (Liverpool: Tate Gallery Liverpool, 1989), p.2.

46. Laura Knight, "Introduction," in Oxford University Press, War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 1. Women (London/ New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1943), pp.5-8.

47. Stephen Spender, "Introduction," in Oxford University Press, War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 4. Air Raids (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1943), pp.4-8.

48. Cecil Beaton, "Introduction," in Oxford University Press, War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 2. Production (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1943), pp.5-7.

49. Minutes of the 6 January and 15 September 1943 meetings.

50. Inter alia: correspondence by R.A. Bevan (General Production Division, MoI) and Admiralty officials, in GP/46/10(A) and (B); Minutes of the 2 January 1940 meeting; correspondence in GP/46/50; and Percy Jowett to Paul Nash, 29 October 1940 (Tate Archive: Paul Nash papers, 7050.1165).

51. MoS, Statutory Rules and Orders, 1941 No.1760: Emergency Powers (Defence), Raw Materials (Paper) (7 November 1941) (London: HMSO, 1941), p.5.

52. A detailed survey of press reproductions of pictures showing Admiralty subjects up to the end of 1940 revealed that of the fifty-nine reproductions so identified, thirty-eight were published within two weeks of the opening of rooms of war art at the National Gallery. Many of the subsequent reproductions appeared during weeks when additional works were put on display at the Gallery. Of the fifty-nine reproductions, only four were published in a newspaper, the remainder appearing in fourteen magazines; see D.W. Cubie (Photographic Division, MoI) to Irene Neville (Clerical Assistant, WAAC), 14 December 1940 (GP/46/10(B)).

53. WAAC, "Paper No.19: Publication of Reproductions of Works by Official War Artists" (January 1940) (GP/72/A(2)); GP/46/10/5; Minutes of the 14 February 1940 meeting; H.R. Francis (Director, Photographic Division, MoI) to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 4 January 1940 (GP/46/10(A)); [Francis] to Muirhead Bone, 26 October 1940 (GP/55/110). On The ILN see especially correspondence between Kenneth Clark and the magazine's Editor, Bruce Ingram, dated December 1939 (NG Archive: Miscellaneous Wartime I, 1939).

54. On the reactions of American newspapers and magazines to reproductions from the war art collection, see the correspondence in GP/99/3. The quotation in the text is taken from an internal memorandum written by H.R. Francis.

55. H.R. Francis (Photographic Division) to Mr. Woodburn (Principal Establishments Officer, MoI), 19 August 1940 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/103).

56. The projects included organising exhibitions in co-ordination with the publication of expensive and de luxe edition books, general and specialist articles, reproductions in newspapers and magazines, posters, Christmas cards, postcards and calendars (MoI, unsigned memorandum (21 April 1941) in MoI (in PRO): INF 1/124). See also the correspondence between E.M.O'R. Dickey, Robert Fraser, and Kenneth Clark, March-April 1941 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/124).

57. WAAC, "Paper No.19: Publication of Reproductions of Works by Official War Artists" (January 1940) (GP/72/A(2)).

58. Minutes of the 14 February 1940 meeting. Clark seems to have overestimated the sales of war art reproductions issued by Wellington House and the Department of Information; see Harries and Harries, The War Artists, op.cit., p.78.

59. See in particular GP/46/10(A), GP/46/27, GP/46/27/1, GP/46/27/3, GP/46/27/4, GP/46/27/5, GP/46/33, GP/46/42 and GP/46/64.

60. Minutes of the 14 February 1940 meeting.

61. Minutes of the 9 April 1941, and the 30 June and 5 July 1942 meetings. See also GP/46/27/3.

62. L. Nash (MoI) to E.C. Gregory, 6 December 1943 (GP/46/B). Sales of photographs to private individuals was discontinued after 31 March 1944.

63. For background information on this project, see especially: WAAC, "Committee Paper No.54. Reproductions for Canteens etc." (GP/72/E(2), p.212); correspondence between MoI officials Mr. Nye, W.G.V. Vaughan and Lord Davidson, April-May 1941 (GP/46/43); Minutes of the 26 February 1941 meeting; WAAC, "O.E.P.E.C. Paper No.1030 - War Artists" (6 November 1941) (GP/46/B).

64. Olive Cook (Publications Officer, National Gallery) to F.L. Paterson (Finance Division, MoI), 5 March 1943 (GP/46/ 50); WAAC, "Interim Report for the Fourth Year of the War" (1943) (both, GP/46/B).

65. The WAAC also loaned individual works or small collections, on request, to Armed Services bases or stations that had provided facilities or sitters to artists working on contract, and to British Restaurants, Ministry of Supply canteens, clubs, municipal authorities, private companies, fund-raising events, senior officials of the Armed Forces or the Government, and provincial art galleries; see: WAAC, "Portraits on Loan to the Royal Air Force" ([February 1942]) (GP/72/F, p.84); Minutes of the 18 December 1940, 30 June 1942, and 24 and 31 March 1943 meetings; GP/46/67; GP/46/79; GP/46/80; GP/46/38; GP/46/39; GP/46/45; GP/46/39; GP/46/78; and GP/46/78/1.

66. WAAC, untitled memorandum [autumn 1945] summarising the Committee's work and implying the need for further funding (GP/46/B).

67. For example: Thomas Bodkin, "Who Cares About Art?," Listener, 23 #590 (2 May 1940), pp.875-877. Paul Wild has noted that most analyses of leisure activities have concentrated on the early nineteenth century and on the Victorian and Edwardian eras rather than the inter-war decades ("Recreation in Rochdale, 1900-40," in John Clarke, Chas Critcher and Richard Johnson, eds., Working-Class Culture: Studies in History and Theory (London: Hutchinson of London, in association with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University

of Birmingham, 1979), p.140). For analyses of leisure patterns, compiled during the War itself, see the file reports produced by Mass-Observation and listed in Section 5 of my bibliography.

68. Mass-Observation, File Report #290: "Women in War-time," pp.221-222 (July 1940). See also Tom Harrisson, Living Through the Blitz (London: Collins, 1976), pp.311-312.

69. Mass-Observation, File Report #337: "Leisure Report," p.5 (August 1940).

70. Mass-Observation, File Report #69: "Theatre," p.1 (April 1940).

71. Norman Longmate, How We Lived Then: A History of Everyday Life During the Second World War (London: Hutchinson & Co Ltd, 1971), pp.411-413.

72. Mass-Observation, File Reports #394: "Mass Observation Film Work," p.2 (September 1940); and #57: "Film Report" (February 1940). The statistics from the 1940 poll must be interpreted carefully. Most of the respondents were women over the age of thirty and this group had a higher dislike of war films (36%) than all other groups combined. In addition, Mass-Observation noted that despite the professed objections to war films, scenes of air raids and actual battle did not provoke much impatience in film audiences.

73. Mass-Observation was the source of the most extensive studies of reading habits throughout the War. See in particular the following file reports: #46: "Book Reading in Wartime" (March 1940); #47: "Wartime Reading" (March 1940); #48: "Selection and Taste in Book Reading, January-February 1940" (March 1940); #1222: "Book Reading Survey. Interim Report, March-April 1942"; and #1498: "Blaina: Study of a Coal Mining Town, with a Brief Introduction by Leonard Woolf" (November 1942).

74. J. Leger & Son, Exhibition of War Drawings by Clifford Hall (London: J. Leger & Son, 1941; the theme of the exhibition was "Bombs on Chelsea"); Thos. Agnew & Sons, Ltd., Exhibition of Pictures from Russia by Feliks Topolski, Polish Official War Artist, Organised by the Polish Relief Fund, Poland's Armed Forces Comforts Fund, [and] the British Committee for Polish Welfare (London: Thos. Agnew & Sons, Ltd., 1942); Czechoslovak Institute, Exhibition of Graphic Art: Callot, "Les Misères de la Guerre," 1633; Goya, "Los Desastres de la Guerra," 1810; Daumier, "War Lithographs," 1870; Szobel, "Civilisation - Lidice," 1942 (London: Czechoslovak Institute, 1942); Cuneo's exhibition, The Unconquerable Soul, consisted of paintings showing the activities of the Resistance in

Occupied Europe.

75. Mass-Observation reports on these exhibitions are in the Tom Harrisson Mass-Observation Archive, Box Art 3, Files A, B, C and D.

76. Mass-Observation, [no title] (typescript, 1940) (Tom Harrisson Mass-Observation Archive: Box Art 1, File H); see also "Impact of the War on Art and Artists: First Four Months of the War" (typescript; 15 January 1940) (Box Art 2, File B, pp.9-10).

77. Peter Davies, A Northern School: Lancashire Artists of the Twentieth Century (Bristol: Redcliffe, 1989).

78. Anonymous, "More Subject Exhibitions?," [AIA] Bulletin, #67 (October 1941), [p.3].

79. Quoted in ibid., p.10.

80. George Edinger, "Everybody Wants to Buy a Picture: There are Not Enough Artists to Paint Them," Daily Mail (24 April 1943), p.2.

81. The 1941 Firemen Artists' exhibition was seen by 30,000 people during its three-week showing at the Royal Academy (J.W. Jackson, "Foreword," in Royal Academy of Arts, Exhibition of Paintings by Firemen Artists (London: The Argus Press, 1941), n.p.). More than 10,000 people visited the first of several Civil Defence Artists' exhibitions, at the Cooling Galleries in 1941; for statistics see the group's catalogues (Cooling Galleries, various years), and its correspondence with the Ministry of Home Security (especially MoHS (in PRO): HO 186/576 and HO 186/1661).

82. E.M.O'R. Dickey, "Bombing & the War Artists Show at National Gallery" (14 October 1940) (GP/72/D(1), p.122).

83. For letters and other documents see GP/46/60.

84. Susan Malvern, Art, Propaganda and Patronage. An History of the Employment of British Artists 1916-1919 (Ph.D. thesis, University of Reading, 1981), pp.141-143.

85. E.M.O'R. Dickey to Muirhead Bone, 4 July 1940 (GP/72/D(1)).

86. Mass-Observation (all: Tom Harrisson Mass-Observation Archive, Box Art 2 File E, and Box Art 3 Files A and C): "War Artists Exhibition. National Gallery," "Report on the Exhibition of Drawings and Paintings by War-Artists in the National Gallery," [handwritten observations, 12 February 1941];

"Art Exhibitions. National Gallery. War Pictures," [handwritten observations], 1 September 1943.

87. For example: Wandering Scot, "Clyde Workers in Paint," Edinburgh Evening News (8 October 1941); H. Granville Fell, "The Connoisseur Divan," Connoisseur, 110 (1942), pp.161-162; anonymous, "Talk of the Day: National Gallery Additions," Evening News (28 May 1942), p.2; anonymous, "Recognition for War Artists," World's Press News (28 May 1942), p.8; Eric Newton, "War Artists' Birthday," Sunday Times (12 March 1944), p.2 (reprinted in Newton's In My View (London/New York/Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co, 1950), pp. 152-153; and anonymous, "Artists in War Paint," Liverpool Daily Post (15 March 1945), p.2.

88. WAAC, "Interim Report for the Second Year of the War," (August 1941), p.2 (GP/46/B).

89. WAAC, "Interim Report for the Third Year of the War," (August 1942), pp.2-3 (GP/46/B).

90. Eric Newton, "War Pictures," Sunday Times (18 May 1941), p.6.

91. Hannen Swaffer, "War Through Frank Eyes," Daily Herald (5 February 1942), p.2.

92. Jan Gordon, "London Commentary," Studio, 126 #608 (November 1943), p.163.

93. H.D. Molesworth, "War Pictures by British Artists," in WAAC, War Pictures by British Artists: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Official War Pictures Selected by the Ministry of Information for Circulation in the West Indies (London: [c.1941]), n.p.

94. Eric Newton, "The Artist as Prophet," Sunday Times (5 January 1941), p.2.

95. Anonymous, "War Artists," New Statesman and Nation, 22 #546 (9 August 1941), p.134.

96. Anonymous, "[title of article unknown]" The Lancet (27 October 1945), p.340.

97. Malvern, Art, Propaganda and Patronage, op.cit., p.294.

98. Minutes of the 23 November 1939 meeting.

99. W.A. Robson, The Development of Local Government (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1931), p.280.

100. Calculated from information given in the 1931 Census of England and Wales (London: HMSO, 1934).

101. Anonymous, "The Claim of the Provinces," National Society of Art Masters Journal, 12 #7 (May-June 1940), pp.126-127; BIAE, Art for the People: Report of the British Institute of Adult Education Experiment in Providing Three Loan Exhibitions at Barnsley, Swindon and Silver End (London: [BIAE?], [1935]), p.11.

102. S.F. Markham, Museums and Art Galleries in the British Isles (London: HMSO, 1938), p.17. An extended criticism of the facilities, collections and funding of provincial art galleries during the 1930's and the Second World War is given in Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts: A Report Sponsored by the Dartington Hall Trustees (London/New York/Toronto: Geoffrey Cumberlege/Oxford University Press, 1946), Chapter 5.

103. For example: anonymous, "Notes and Notices: The Re-opening of Museums," Museums Journal, 40 #1 (April 1940), p.13.

104. Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts, op.cit., p.136.

105. Anonymous, "The Claim of the Provinces," op.cit., pp.126-127.

106. Eric Newton, "The Sacred Square Mile," New Statesman and Nation, 21 #540 (28 June 1941), p.650.

107. Leisure Society statement, quoted in E.D. Mackerness, A Social History of English Music (London/Toronto: Routledge & Kegan Paul/University of Toronto Press, 1964), p.267.

108. League of Audiences statement, quoted in ibid., p.267.

109. W.G. Constable, "Art and the Ordinary Man," Listener, 13 #325 (3 April 1935), pp.535-536.

110. Mass-Observation, File Report #871: "Report on Government Exhibitions" (October 1941). See also File Report #2361: "Report on Modern Homes Exhibition" (April 1946).

111. Eric Newton, "War Pictures by British Artists," in WAAC, War Pictures by British Artists: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Official War Pictures Circulated by the Ministry of Information by Arrangement with the Museums Association. First Selection (London/Harrow: George Pullman & Sons, Ltd, [1940]), n.p.



112. Jan Gordon, "War Artists - 1940," in WAAC, War Pictures by British Artists Catalogue of an Exhibition of Original Drawings and Paintings of War Subjects Circulated by the Ministry of Information for Exhibition in Schools. First Selection (London/Harrow: George Pullman & Sons, Ltd, 1942), pp.2,3,5.

113. Several references to the great, and sometimes unprecedented, popularity enjoyed by provincial art galleries and museums during the War are included in A.C.R. Carter, comp., The Year's Art, 1942-1944: A Concise Epitome of All Matters Relating to the Arts of Painting, Sculpture, Engraving and Architecture, and to Schools of Design, Which Have Occurred During the Years 1941, 1942, 1943, Together with Information Respecting the Events of the Year 1944, with Full-page Illustrations (London: Hutchinson and Co (Publishers) Ltd, [1944]); and Carter, The Year's Art, 1945-1947.... See also CEMA, The Fifth Year: The End of the Beginning. Report on the Work of C.E.M.A. for 1944 (London: CEMA, [1945]).

114. Anonymous, "Recent and Current Exhibitions: War Artists: Second Circulating Exhibition," Museums Journal, 40 #2 (March 1941), p.332.

115. G.R.H., "Exhibition of War Pictures," [Aberdeen] Press and Journal (25 March 1941), p.2.

116. The Council's outlook was pro-British rather than anti-foreign, and it avoided engaging in any activities that could be construed as being directly associated with politics or traditional propaganda; see Diana Jane Eastment, The Policies and Position of the British Council from the Outbreak of War to 1950 (Ph.D. thesis, University of Leeds, 1982).

117. Minutes of the 10 October 1941 meeting.

118. The proof that the exhibition was propagandist in intention was given in a memorandum to the MoI's Overseas Planning Committee, dated 18 March 1941 (GP/46/24/4/B).

119. Herbert Read, "The War as Seen by British Artists," in Museum of Modern Art (New York), Britain at War (Monroe Wheeler, ed.) (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1941), p.12.

120. John Rothenstein, Brave Day Hideous Night: Autobiography 1939-1965 (I) (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1966), p.59.

121. Edward R. Murrow, quoted in Anthony Rhodes, Propaganda: The Art of Persuasion: World War II (Victor Margolin, ed.), vol.1 (New York/London: Chelsea House Publishers, 1976), p.111. Murrow's broadcasts were published in This is London (Elmer Davis, ed.) (New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1941).

122. Lord Halifax, quoted in anonymous, "Lord Halifax Opens Exhibition of 'Britain at War' Art Here," [May 1941] [unidentified New York newspaper; clipping in 1941 newspaper reviews folder in IWM: Art].

123. Representative examples include: Margit Varga, "Britain Mobilizes Her Artists. What About America?," Magazine of Art, 34 #6 (June-July 1941), p.298; Emily Genauer, "Britain at War - A Stirring Exhibit," [copy in Museum of Modern Art Archive, New York incorrectly identified as New York Times, 19 May 1941]; and James W. Lane, "Mars & Ars Britannica: England Expects Every Artist To Do His Duty," Art News, 40 (August 1941), pp.13,28.

124. Elodie Courter Museum of Modern Art) to H.O. McCurry (Director, National Gallery of Canada), 13 June 1941 (NGC: File #5.5-13 - Exhibitions in Gallery: Britain at War Exhibition, 1941.

125. Relevant correspondence is in GP/46/52.

126. See, for example, Kenneth Clark's telegram to H.O. McCurry, 4 June 1941, and his follow-up letter of 12 June (NGC: 5.5-B - Exhibitions in the Gallery: Britain at War Exhibition, 1941, File #1).

127. The most reliable and complete information is given not in GP/46/52, but in the archives of the Canadian galleries that received the Britain at War exhibition: the National Gallery of Canada (especially the three-part File #5.5-B, op. cit.); the Art Gallery of Ontario (where the Minutes books give 1941 attendance figures for specific exhibitions at the Art Gallery of Toronto, as the AGO was then known) and the Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal (File #132 - Britain at War).

128. For a typical, favourable review of Britain at War in San Francisco, see Dorothy Pucinelli, "Art: San Francisco," California Arts and Architecture, 59 (May 1942), pp.8-9. The files of the Circulating Exhibitions Department of the Museum of Modern Art (New York) Archive contains what appears to be a tentative list of American institutions to which the exhibition was to be sent after it closed in San Francisco.

129. H.O. McCurry to Elodie Courter, 15 and 31 October 1941 (NGC: op.cit.).

130. Quoted in several newspaper articles, including: anonymous, "Germans Would Kill All Art," London [Ontario] Free Press (15 November 1941), p.15.

131. Helen Bannerman, "Art, Music, Drama: Five Stars," The [University of Toronto] Varsity (18 November 1941), n.p.

132. Robert Ayre, "Art News and Reviews: 'Britain at War' Paintings Miss Aim, Critic Finds," [Montreal] Gazette, [incorrectly dated 10 January 1942 in Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal Archive newspaper clippings scrapbook]. "To ennoble ... the pride of the people" was quoted by Ayre from the exhibition catalogue.

133. Anonymous, "'Britain at War' Paintings," Montreal Standard ([incorrectly dated 31 January 1941 in Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal Archive press clippings scrapbook]).

134. Mrs. A. Harrison (Latin American Division, MoI), to G. Elmslie Owen, 28 May 1943 (GP/46/24/20).

135. Passing reference to the success of the exhibition is given in a letter written by Charles H. Fox (British Legation, Guatemala) to the MoI Latin American Division, on 20 November 1945 (GP 46/24/20). As an example of favourable press reaction, see an article by the poet Salarrue, "Una Exposicion de Arte Britanico en San Salvador," Centro America (28 October 1945 [sic]), pp.2-4.

136. Only very incomplete and sometimes inaccurate information about the Australian and New Zealand tour has been located in the relevant WAAC file (GP/46/98). Further documentation is in the archive of the Art Gallery of New South Wales, Sydney (Minutes of the 28 July 1944 meeting of the Trustees); the archive of the Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide (exhibition records); the National Library of New Zealand and the archive of the National Gallery (both, Wellington; see especially correspondence in the National Gallery's alphabetical file W).

137. Quoted in Harries and Harries, The War Artists, op.cit., p.269.

138. Recorded in articles such as: anonymous, "War Pictures: Exhibition Opened," [Wellington] Evening Post (14 April 1945), p.9.

139. Mr. Lewes (British Council), "Memorandum on British Cultural Propaganda in the West Indies" [1940] (British Council (in PRO), BW 2/89).

140. Kenneth Clark to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 6 May 1941 (GP 46/62).

141. Molesworth, "War Pictures by British Artists," op.cit., n.p.

142. Correspondence between Kenneth Clark and by a Ministry official identified only as "H.W.," all written in May 1941 (GP 46/62).

143. Extant correspondence about the exhibition is convoluted and incomplete; see especially GP/46/24/17, GP/46/69 and GP/46/109. Sample press reactions include: P.H.W., "War Paintings," Cape Times (15 February 1945); L.S. "Mayor Opens Exhibition of Paintings by British and Union War Artists," Rand Daily Mail (8 November 1944); D. Krige (Secretary, South African National Gallery), "War Art Exhibition [letter to the Editor]," Trek (9 March 1945); and anonymous, "War Pictures," Cape Times (6 March 1945).

144. GP/46/84; and British Council (in PRO): BW 67/5.

145. Correspondence about the tour of Wilkinson's pictures to Australia and New Zealand occupies some eighty pages in GP/55/111 (pp.39-119), but the information is very incomplete. See also the exhibition records of the Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide; the archive of the Art Gallery of New South Wales, Sydney (Minutes of the meeting of the Trustees on 21 September 1945); the Australian War Memorial (file AWM 93); and the archive of the New Zealand National Gallery, Wellington (Minutes of the 13 February 1947 meeting of the National Gallery Committee of Management; correspondence between R. Darroch (Honorary Secretary, New Zealand Navy League War Council, Wellington) and Eru Gore (Secretary, New Zealand Academy of Fine Arts), 1 and 6 November 1946, and 24 March 1947 (Alphabetical Files N and W).

146. Norman Wilkinson, "Note by the Artist," in WAAC, The War at Sea: A Series of Paintings by Norman Wilkinson, O.B.E., P.R.I. ([London or Australia]: 1945), p.3.

147. E.C. Simpson, "Exhibition of War Paintings by British Artist," [Wellington] Southern Cross (13 March 1947). See also: anonymous, "A Special Exhibition: 'The War at Sea' by Norman Wilkinson," [Sydney] Bulletin (20 August 1945), p.13; anonymous, "Exhibition of War Pictures," [Sydney] Herald (22 October 1945), p.48; and anonymous, "'MACH': I'll Back the Artist Against the Photographer," [Sydney] Bulletin (28 November 1945), p.72.

148. Nicholas, "Is British Art Fighting?," op.cit., p.122.

## Chapter 5

### Picturing the War

"We in our haste can only see the small components of the scene  
We cannot tell what incidents will focus on the final screen.  
A barrage of disruptive sound, a petal on a sleeping face,  
Both must be noted, both must have their place...."  
-Donald Bain, "War Poet"<sup>1</sup>

Over the course of the Second World War the members of the War Artists' Advisory Committee acquired 6000 portraits, home front scenes and views of the Armed Forces' activities. Kenneth Clark and his colleagues could therefore claim to have amassed a fairly detailed visual history of Britain at war. It was not, however, an exhaustive or perfectly balanced history. Instead, it reflected the opinions of the Committee and its artists as to what was worth recording and in how much detail. An analysis of the paintings, drawings, prints and sculptures acquired by the WAAC may thus be used to examine the interests and ideals of the Committee and its artists in particular and - by extension - of British society in general.

The arguments and conclusions presented in this chapter are derived primarily from the visual analysis of all the items included in the war art collection. This analysis involved the identification of what seem to be the principal points of thematic interest in each work, and the subsequent ordering of these points within more general categories. The

criteria employed in the determination of individual themes, as well as in the establishing of the general categories, are those of the author. It is recognised that these criteria may differ somewhat from those that might be proposed by other analysts, but the potential for variation does not seem sufficiently large to seriously weaken the conclusions reached in the following pages.

However, it should be noted that the analysis has not been intended as a detailed examination of the style or iconology of individual artworks, or as an analysis of the ways in which specific artists' styles changed in response to the challenge of making war art. These are huge topics, deserving of theses in themselves, and they do not constitute the focus of this particular study. Rather, it is the aim of this chapter to identify subjects that are conspicuous either by their frequency or (more rarely) their infrequency of representation, and then to suggest reasons to account for this quality of conspicuousness within the wider context of the framework of contemporary social beliefs and attitudes. The War, because it was a traumatic experience that cast into doubt the very survival of the country as an independent political unit, was also an ideal catalyst for the highlighting of beliefs and attitudes about (for example) what characteristics made Britain unique. In this sense the war art collection, taken as a whole, constitutes a large self-portrait of British society.

Finally, it should be recorded that any such analysis of

an art collection like that of the WAAC must be undertaken with care, as there were in operation several factors that interfered with the original intentions of the Committee and of the artists. For example, the WAAC was usually unwilling to accept work which its members agreed was poorly done, even if no other representations of the subjects were available. This inevitably reduced the scope and detail of its coverage of the War. The same limitations resulted from the WAAC's frequent reiteration of its desire to match artists with subjects to which they were sympathetic. If the Committee gave an artist a contract for a particular subject because it was believed that he or she was singularly well-qualified to execute it, if the artist subsequently reneged on the contract, and if a comparably suitable artist could not be found, the assignment was not necessarily re-issued to anyone else.<sup>2</sup> In other cases, circumstances over which the WAAC had little or no control interfered with its collecting activities. Even within Britain transportation for artists to places of interest could be erratic. R.V. Pitchforth, for example, lamented that he was unable to produce interesting air raid damage pictures because by the time he was finally able to reach the site of a direct hit, ARP personnel were well-advanced in the job of cleaning up the mess.<sup>3</sup> Nor did the WAAC exercise consistent control over the sizes, media, or even the subjects of many of the works that it acquired from its official war artists, or from artists engaged to fulfill short-term contracts. In particu-

lar, the official war artists working abroad were, of necessity, often left more or less to their own devices, with the result that the Committee acquired a number of works of which it might otherwise have remained happily bereft.

Yet despite these considerations, examination of the items accumulated with funds administered by the WAAC does suggest some remarkably consistent patterns. The Committee's war art was not a neutral collection of images, but rather a complex network of visual documents that, taken as a whole, tended to project a specific vision of Britain at war. An analysis of the war art collection gives evidence of an underlying acceptance, and promotion, of some of the central assumptions and ideals of which that vision was comprised.

### Portraits

The commissioning and purchasing of portraits of civilians (illustration 2) was of major interest to the WAAC because of the close involvement of the home front population in the production of war supplies, and because of that population's vulnerability as a target of enemy aggression. Although only one official war artist (Bernard Hailstone, as Ministry of Information artist in 1940-1941) was assigned to concentrate on civilian (in his case, Ministry of Supply) portraits, fully three-fifths of all civilian portraits were the results of contracts for which the sitters had been



selected on the artists' behalfs by the WAAC, the Ministry of Home Security or the Ministry of Supply. The WAAC itself thus exercised a substantial degree of control over who was ultimately represented in the collection, and the portraits therefore constitute a useful body of works to examine in search of underlying social expectations and ideals.

The first such ideal supported the notion of a population united, in purpose and determination, across the boundaries (of class, gender and age) that usually acted as indicators of difference and division. The Ministry of Information itself had a standing policy of attempting to sustain civilian morale by emphasising not only the justness of the British cause, but also the commitment of the entire country to all aspects of the war effort regardless of social, economic or political differences between citizens.<sup>4</sup> The same sense of a shared national life was evident in wartime documentary films. Notable among the latter were those by Humphrey Jennings, including London Can Take It (a testament to British defiance of Germany at a time when invasion often seemed imminent), and Listen to Britain (in which sophisticated editing implies a tight network of associations between members of different social groups, and between present-day Britain and its glorious past).

A second ideal was focused more specifically upon the concept of "ordinary" citizens, rather than their leaders, as important participants in, and as heroes and heroines of, the

War. This emphasis upon acknowledging the importance of specific "ordinary" people reflected Kenneth Clark's own realisation (as Controller of Home Publicity at the MoI) that the Ministry was too often seen to be treating the general population as an undifferentiated collection of faceless bodies to whom it talked down from an aristocratic height.<sup>5</sup> More generally, the WAAC's interest in "ordinary" people mirrored the widespread discernment that this was "the people's war," and that new and more broadly democratic approaches to social organisation were expected after its conclusion. From the Art for the People exhibitions to the Beveridge Report, examples of this line of thought were omnipresent. To its credit, the WAAC seems to have appreciated them. Aside from its interest in "ordinary" civilians, the Committee's early decision to ignore First World War precedent, by encouraging little-known artists to submit work on speculation, was another manifestation of this phenomenon.

Yet WAAC portraits of non-Services personnel took a surprisingly long time to begin appearing. Only four were acquired in 1939. In two cases the fact that the sitter was not a member of the Armed Forces appears to have been coincidental, and the other two portraits were of members of the government: Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs Lord Halifax (by Eric Kennington) and Minister of Labour and National Service Ernest Brown (by William Roberts). Even by the end of 1940, in which year several thousand civilians had received awards for

gallantry or exceptional national service, only two artists (Kenneth Green and F. Ernest Jackson) had been given contracts to produce portraits of civilians (two and six factory workers, respectively).

The WAAC's initial slowness to acquire portraits of civilians (and thus to acknowledge the importance and reliability of civilians as a cornerstone of the war effort) was paralleled by the tone adopted by the BBC over the course of the first year of the War. During that time the Corporation invested an inordinate amount of energy in exhorting its listeners to support the war effort, the assumption being that the general population needed constant encouragement from on high, without which its willingness to withstand the Battle of Britain would collapse. MoI memoranda from 1939 and much of 1940 record official opinion that intensive aerial bombing would crush civilian morale completely, and result in an epidemic of insanity. Both the MoI and the BBC responded to this anticipation with a pronounced tendency to lecture and exhort.

In 1941, however, it had become clear that even the severe bombardment of cities, and the widely-acknowledged probability of invasion, had failed to destroy civilian morale. Indeed, one of the most important lessons learned from the Battle of Britain was that civilian determination to resist actually increased in response to air attack.<sup>6</sup> The WAAC, the BBC and the entertainment media accordingly changed their earlier attitudes towards the role of the civilian population

in the War. Not only did the BBC tone down its schoolmistress tone after 1940; it also formulated other broadcasting policies intended to acknowledge and champion the population's solidarity.<sup>7</sup> Not the least of these policies was its decision to move away from its earlier reliance upon announcers with Oxbridge accents. It also expanded its presentation of talks and discussion programmes concerned with the lives and opinions of middle- and lower-class listeners, and introduced such programmes as Worker's Playtime, Hi Gang and ITMA (with the latter's Mrs. Mopp, the humorous and - as letters to the BBC proved - inspiring charlady, characterised by her readiness to work and her determination to carry on as best she could in the midst of the War).

Similarly, whereas early wartime feature films (Night Train to Munich, Ships With Wings and others) had tended to concentrate on members of the upper classes who seemed to embody the most desirable aspects of the national character, these were soon superceded by productions (such as Noël Coward's In Which We Serve) that were populated by middle- and lower-class people who emerged as something other than stock characters. These films also leaned towards employing non-actors to portray themselves, as exemplified by the Crown Film Unit's use of Auxiliary Fire Service employees in Fires Were Started (1943). Such changes were effected in fits and starts. Robert Colls and Philip Dodd, for example, have argued that films like Fires Were Started combined a valorisation of East

End civilians with a reinforcement of the proper relations between classes within a "national-collectivist myth" of war-time unity;<sup>8</sup> but films like Fires Were Started nonetheless did represent a significant change in the way film-makers viewed the audiences who packed the theatres. A comparable shift in attitude occurred at the MoI, where the infamous "Your courage, your cheerfulness, your resolution will bring us victory" poster of the early days of the War provoked such hostile criticism that it was succeeded by posters (like one showing Churchill's confident face, and the words "Let us go forward together") that were consciously less class-divisive. Similarly, the MoI's documentary films, as well as the BBC's Foreign Service broadcasts, promoted a denial of the importance of class differences in wartime Britain.<sup>9</sup>

All of these changes were reflected in the WAAC's approach to portraits of civilians, beginning in c.1941. The sole royal personage included in the entire war art collection was the Duchess of Kent, sculpted by C.W. Dyson-Smith only because of her position as the Chief WRN. A comparable reticence governed the Committee's opinion about portraits of politicians. In April 1940, for example, the WAAC declined to approve Henry Lamb's request to paint the entire War Cabinet.<sup>10</sup> In 1940 the Director-General of the MoI advocated the commissioning of intimate "conversation piece" portraits of members of the Cabinet and their wives, which he believed would be more desirable acquisitions than would "lots of por-

trait heads [which] will in the end be an embarrassment to us."<sup>11</sup> Although Clark reluctantly agreed to pursue this idea, he was not optimistic about it, and no such portraits of members of the Cabinet ever entered the war art collection. In fact, by the end of 1942 the WAAC had adopted a policy not to commission portraits of politicians until the War had ended, and it kept to this intention. In part the 1942 policy was a recognition of the fact that members of the government had little time to spare for sittings; but it is significant that even after VE Day only three politicians (Churchill, John Anderson, and Ernest Bevin) had their features recorded for the WAAC (all by Jacob Epstein).<sup>12</sup>

The WAAC discouraged portraits not only of royalty and of politicians, but of authority figures in general. A 1945 proposal from an artist named Ivor Williams, to paint a series of portraits of captains of industry, was diplomatically side-stepped.<sup>13</sup> Also in 1945 the Committee commissioned seventeen portraits of scientists whose discoveries had been instrumental in the prosecution of the War, but this was done all at once, very near the end of the War, and almost as an after-thought. Thus the overall impression that emerges from a study of the portraits of civilians is that, during and after the Battle of Britain, official recognition was given to the courage and determination of the general public.

Approximately 150 British civilians became the subjects of single or (more rarely) group portraits as the WAAC chron-

icled the emergence of a united and integrated culture in which everyone had an important role to play. The sitters included factory workers, firemen or firewomen, Civil Defence workers, shipbuilders, nurses and transport workers, usually shown in informal poses. Within these parameters, however, the Committee's choice of sitters was an unbalanced one - and not only because it tended to omit political and social leaders. The lack of balance was noted by, among others, Henry Carr. "...Several people remarked on the lack of female portraits," wrote Carr, in criticism of the war art exhibition at the National Gallery in December 1940, "and this seems to be a strange omission, considering the position of women in the war."<sup>14</sup> This criticism was made fairly early in the WAAC's career, but was repeated at intervals by correspondents like Lady Robertson, who urged Clark to give greater coverage to the work of individual nurses.<sup>15</sup>

To the WAAC's credit, it did make efforts to address these concerns. In 1941 J.T.A. Burke (as Ministry of Home Security representative on the Committee) wrote a letter to MoHS staff, specifically requesting lists of appropriate female sitters. Of the six oils or pastels and the twelve drawings that were to be commissioned on the basis of his final list, the Committee endorsed the view that, "Other things being equal, it was desirable that women's portraits should have priority...."<sup>16</sup> Also in 1941, when A.R. Middleton Todd responded to a commission to paint four portraits by

submitting, as the first of them, a picture of a man, the Committee's Secretary pointed out to him, "When the Committee originally made the recommendation that you should be commissioned they did, as a matter of fact, particularly favour the idea of your painting some of the women who have been decorated for outstanding services...."<sup>17</sup> Yet at the end of the War men still outnumbered women in portraits of civilians by a factor of more than three to one.<sup>1</sup>

The WAAC in general, and the Ministry of Home Security in particular, also went to some trouble to suggest national cohesiveness and the severity of the War's impact throughout the country, by collecting portraits of civilians living in widely-scattered locations. When canvassing his staff for suitable portrait subjects, J.T.A. Burke told his staff that he wanted the resulting list of names to represent "as many types of civilian heroism as possible. Care will be taken to see that the list covers Scotland, Wales and the main divisions of England...."<sup>18</sup> A year later, in 1942, a Ministry spokeswoman stressed the importance of close cooperation with the Scottish Office. Contracts for portraits frequently stated where the sitters should live, even if no specific individuals had yet been selected. Towns or cities of residence are known with certainty for more than half of the sitters. They include (aside from London and towns in the southeast), several cities

---

<sup>1</sup> A hypothesis to account for this is proposed in the "Home Front Subjects" section, below.



and towns in Scotland and in the industrial Midlands, and smaller numbers of places in less heavily-populated areas (Wales, the West Country, and the North).

The overwhelming preference for portraits of identified people, whether or not they were well-known, may also be interpreted as a consideration of key importance. If the civilian population was treated by the MoI as an amorphous mass to be issued with instructions in 1939 and much of 1940, its performance during the Battle of Britain entitled its members to be recognised as interesting individuals. The War Artists' Advisory Committee therefore avoided generalised or "type" portraits that sacrificed an individual personality to abstract qualities such as selflessness or bravery, and that in any case were discredited in Britain because of the important position that they occupied in Nazi art.<sup>19</sup> Even if the name of a sitter was unknown his or her likeness was sufficiently detailed to convince the viewer that the portrait was not a fabrication. This is the case, for example, with the person shown in illustration 2, A Woman Bus Conductor. The particularity of her features, combined with the prominence given to the number printed on her identification badge, marks her as a specific individual, even though her name is unrecorded.

Yet although it avoided "type" portraiture, the WAAC wished to balance the "ordinariness" of many of its portrait subjects with the implication that those sitters nonetheless embodied desirable "national" characteristics. It therefore

preferred its portrait subjects to have made (as was the case with the scientists whose portraits it commissioned in 1945) a unique contribution to the general war effort, or (more commonly) to have distinguished themselves by means of admirable actions. Comparison of the names of portrait sitters with the names of winners of awards and honours (the latter including, among others, the George Cross, the George Medal and the British Empire Medal) indicates that - especially for its commissioned portraits - the WAAC usually favoured sitters who had received at least one wartime decoration.

Eight of the approximately 150 sitters (two men and six women) had won the George Medal, and three men had won the George Cross. Yet a total of 1427 individuals (many of them civilians) were awarded the George Medal during the War, and 110 others (38 of them civilians) were given the George Cross.<sup>20</sup> It is thus clear that at no time did the WAAC consider compiling a gallery of portraits of all, or even many, of the recipients of these particularly important awards. Instead, it included many winners of other awards. The sitters were selected on the bases of a variety of criteria (such as sex, place of residence, age and job) so as to indicate that heroism was an attribute shared amongst all ranks of British civilians. Marion Patterson, for example, was a fire guard who was one of the only eight civilian portrait subjects to have been awarded the George Medal. She was singled out by the WAAC as a worthy subject for Robert Sivell, apparently (in part)

because she had the distinction of being the first female fire guard to be awarded the Medal, and in part because she presented an opportunity for the WAAC to add a portrait of a Scot to its visual records.<sup>21</sup> Nor does it seem coincidental that Charity Bick, who was painted by A.R. Thomson in 1941, happened to be both female and the youngest Civil Defence worker to date to receive the George Medal. Similarly, in the realm of the Armed Services, it seems significant that Laura Knight was given a lucrative contract to paint portraits of the first three members of the Women's Auxiliary Air Force to win the Military Medal, rather than to portray any of their male counterparts who had won the same award, or even other, more rarely-bestowed awards (such as the Victoria Cross).

Study of the civilian men and women whose features were recorded for the WAAC thus gives the impression that gallantry was a characteristic common to a broad cross-section of "ordinary" citizens during the War. The insistence upon individual particularity allowed the qualities of heroism and self-sacrifice to seem less rhetorical, and thus more likely of attainment in one's own life, regardless of one's personal circumstances. Similarly, the portraits were presented primarily as unbiased documentary records that steered clear of subjects (such as members of royalty) whose portraits had long been employed in propagandist images.

The WAAC waited until 1941 before commissioning more than

a few portraits of civilians; but it demonstrated an early and enthusiastic acquisitions policy for portraits of military figures, the vast majority of them single-sitter works (illustrations 3-4). The initial eagerness for the portraits derived largely from the Committee's awareness of the success that had been enjoyed, during the First World War, of postcard reproductions of portrait drawings of Army, Navy and Air Force officers. In December 1939 Committee members recorded that they were particularly anxious to commission such portraits because of the perceived importance of popularising Forces sitters at a time when none of them were involved in operations that seemed particularly warlike.<sup>22</sup> This immediate and short-term need outweighed the recognition that (as the Imperial War Museum's Keeper of Art wrote to The Times), "[with the passage of time] many of the [First World War] sitters had ceased to be stars of the first magnitude in the public eye, and [the portraits] were gradually returned to their portfolios...."<sup>23</sup>

There is an important difference between the WAAC's portraits of civilians and its portraits of Armed Forces personnel. The latter have more the character of traditional historical records, in terms of their reliance upon sitters who represented the power structures within the Armed Forces (i.e., officers rather than enlisted personnel, and men rather than women). The portraits from the Forces thus have much to say about the immediate practical interests of the Armed

Services themselves.<sup>2</sup>

The WAAC should have expected this. Its three Services representatives, though lacking reasons to interfere strongly in the selection of civilian sitters, were public relations officers who had a professional interest in promoting the reputations of men (and occasionally women) who had risen to positions of responsibility in the Air Force, Army and Navy.<sup>3</sup> The first two dozen pictures to be acquired by the WAAC were therefore almost all portraits of high-ranking Armed Services personnel. R.G. Eves, for example, was the only portraitist among the War Office's first four artists, and he restricted himself to painting portraits of senior officers with the British Expeditionary Force in France during the first months of 1940, setting them in formal poses and emphasising their

---

<sup>2</sup> The following proposals to account for the preponderance of officers in Armed Services portraits does not include the suggestion that this imbalance was a compensatory device exploited in partial response to the unheroic character of the subjects in the overwhelming majority of Services subject pictures acquired by the WAAC. This idea is developed only later in this chapter (in the section "Armed Services Subjects"), within the context of the WAAC's paucity of battle paintings.

<sup>3</sup> For purposes of analysis, I have relied upon the Armed Services division of personnel into three categories: commissioned officers, warrant and non-commissioned officers, and enlisted personnel. Under the auspices of the Admiralty, commissioned officers who were painted or sculpted for the WAAC ranged from Sub-Lieutenants to Admirals. Commissioned officers serving under the Air Ministry reached from Pilot Officers to Air Chief Marshals, while those who came under the jurisdiction of the War Office, and whose features were recorded for the WAAC, included everyone from Second Lieutenants to Generals. In the Air Force and the Army, portrait subjects were spread fairly evenly across the several ranks of commissioned officers. In the Admiralty by far the heaviest emphasis was upon Lieutenants, Lieutenant Commanders, and Captains.

air of command (illustration 3). Although the Admiralty and War Office representatives soon began to endorse the acquisition of portraits of sailors and soldiers,<sup>24</sup> all three Armed Services continued throughout the War to lean heavily towards favouring portraits of officers.<sup>25</sup>

Neither the War Office nor the Admiralty, however, matched the Air Ministry for interest in portraiture in general, and portraits of officers in particular. Only about 900 of the WAAC's artworks adopted Air Ministry-related subjects (portraits as well as theme-based pictures) as their primary or exclusive points of interest, compared to 1500 for the Admiralty and 1900 for the War Office; but 40% of these are portraits. The corresponding figures for the Admiralty and the War Office are only about 20% and 12%, respectively. Further, among the approximately 360 Air Ministry portraits, likenesses of officers outnumber those of non-officers by sixteen to one. The War Office total is better-balanced, with slightly less than five times as many officers' as enlisted men's and women's portraits. Portrayals of officers in the Royal Navy and Merchant Marine outnumber those of non-officers by slightly more than three to one. Until 1945 the Air Ministry had only two official artists at any given time. After mid-1940, however, one of them was always a portraitist: Eric Kennington (1940-1942), A.R. Thomson (1942-1944), and William Dring (1944-1946). The text of the 1942 Oxford University Press booklet of reproductions of RAF pictures from the war art

collection dwelt almost exclusively upon the portraits, which its author uncompromisingly described as "the most remarkable part ... of this book."<sup>26</sup>

The Air Ministry's emphasis on portraits of officers may have been partly derived from the particular fondness of Harold Peake for the idea of a gentlemanly war in which the bounds of decorum and taste were closely monitored. In 1940 he told Paul Nash (shortly before dismissing him from his position as one of the Ministry's official war artists) that his Aerial Creatures watercolours of anthropomorphised British aircraft would be a greater success with members of the RAF than his Raiders series of crashed German aircraft, "for the same reason that pictures of horses are much more attractive to hunting men than are pictures of the dead fox!"<sup>27</sup> (Analogously, the MoI naval advisor explained that no photographs had been taken of the last moments of the Bismarck because, "After all, an Englishman would not like to take snapshots of a fine vessel sinking."<sup>28</sup>)

The fascination of the Air Ministry with RAF officers as portrait subjects also owed much to the fact that the Ministry was the youngest of the three Armed Services. Its three functional Commands - Fighter, Bomber and Coastal - were only three years old when the War began, and the Ministry was, accordingly, engaged in an aggressive publicity campaign to counteract its junior status. Its programme of courting war correspondents was one way of achieving this. Acquiring por-

traits of the most heroic sitters available was another, and became particularly successful when the advent of the Battle of Britain gave the RAF a firm grip on the public imagination. (Public fascination with airmen was also reflected in the fact that their daring exploits constituted a dominant theme in contemporary literature.<sup>29</sup>)

However, if the Air Ministry portraits in particular (and Armed Services portraits in general) differ from the civilian portraits in their emphasis upon figures of authority, in other important respects the two categories of portraits show telling points of similarity. For example, "type" portraiture was as strongly discouraged for Services sitters as it was for civilians, even when the subject was not drawn from the ranks of officers. At the beginning of 1944 the WAAC did approve a proposal by Alan Durst to sculpt an idealised head of a Royal Marine, and subsequently purchased two of the artist's busts that were "intended to record the rank and file who have gained no mention or special distinction";<sup>30</sup> but this was not common practice. The furthest the Committee tended to go in this direction was to acquire from Eric Kennington some 150 portraits of clearly-identified Air Force and (later) Navy sitters whose stylised faces nonetheless emphasised the abstract qualities of stoicism and bravery which Kennington believed to be common to airmen and sailors (illustration 4). (According to a contemporary reviewer, "Mr. Kennington has [not] suppressed individuality in favour of a type, but rather



... the intense concentration upon the individual subject ... has brought out common characteristics."<sup>31</sup>) On occasions when Kennington showed a propensity to supplement his physiognomically-accurate likenesses with entirely generic "type" portraits, the Air Ministry representative on the WAAC expressed the "greatest disfavour."<sup>32</sup>

Directly related to this discouraging of "type" portraits was a second characteristic as common to the likenesses of Armed Services personnel as to those of civilians: the preference (strongly argued by the WAAC's representatives from the Services) for subjects who had been honoured for their deeds. In 1941, for example, the Committee rejected the idea of commissioning Kennington to draw portraits of airmen from the West Indies, on the grounds that "priority [...should be] given to [British] airmen who had been decorated, of whom many were as yet unrecorded."<sup>33</sup> Not surprisingly (given the aggressive views of its Public Relations Section on the uses of portraiture), the Air Ministry was particularly diligent at seeking out airmen who had been decorated. This applied both to officers and to enlisted men. Comparatively few of the latter were featured in portraits but, of those who did become sitters, fully 85% had won the Distinguished Flying Medal. (This award was available only to enlisted personnel in the Air Force.) The corresponding figures for the Army and the Navy were 73% (Distinguished Conduct Medal and/or Military Medal), and 31% (Distinguished Service Medal).

A third point of similarity between civilian and Forces portraiture (this one directly related to the dominance of authority figures in the Services portraits) involved the representation of women. Just as the downplaying of type portraiture had its concomitant factor in the emphasis upon sitters' personal heroism, so was the latter characteristic most frequently identified with men. A large part of the problem was the fact that women in the Armed Forces were all members of the Auxiliary Services: the Women's Auxiliary Air Force, the Auxiliary Territorial Service, or the Women's Royal Naval Service. This often implied that their chief purpose was to assist their male counterparts, fading into the background while the men held the portrait spotlight. Members of the WRNS, the WAAF, the ATS and related nursing services accounted for only 1%-3% of all portrait subjects, but this was numerically inconsistent with the actual prevalence of women in the Services during most of the War. In December 1939 only 2.8 women were in the Auxiliary Services (including related nursing services) for every one hundred men in the Forces, and this figure fell to 2.6 by December 1940. Thereafter, however, it rose steadily, to 6.0 (1941), 9.9 (1942) and 10.5 (1943), before declining to 10.1 (1944) and 9.4 (June 1945).<sup>34</sup> Especially for the years 1941-1945, therefore, the war art portrait collection gives a distorted view of the prevalence of servicewomen. Rather than being portrait sitters, women - both civilians and servicewomen - tended to be represented in

subject pictures (by artists such as Laura Knight and Robert Austin) that showed unidentified WRNS, WAAFS and ATS personnel engaged in appropriate duties.<sup>4</sup>

The war art collection even includes more likenesses of non-British male sitters than it does of British servicewomen. Non-white men were acceptable - even admirable - as subjects, insofar as they encouraged a sense of solidarity of purpose within the Empire. In twenty months as a War Office artist William Coldstream produced only nine paintings, of which four were portraits of soldiers in the Indian Army, but at no time did the WAAC suggest that he paint British soldiers instead. Anthony Gross, sent to Burma to record Anglo-Indian cooperation there, responded with the series of group portraits (illustration 5) that were greeted with enthusiasm by the India Office. Similarly, when Gross was in Africa in 1943 he was specifically requested to take note of African troops. However, when he informed the Committee that the only "African" troops within range were American Negroes, he added, "I hardly think they should be publicised." The Committee, perhaps concluding that Americans could not be construed as part of the Empire's war effort and that they were only of interest if they happened to be stationed in Britain, primly concurred that "American negroes would not be quite satisfactory."<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> This point is considered at greater length in the following section, in which the numerous representations of the Women's Land Army are assessed in relation to the much less numerous portraits of individual female civilians.

### Home Front Subjects

Total war required the utilisation of the entire civilian population in the prosecution of the war effort. This, and the fact that mainland Britain was as much in the front line as anyplace on the Continent, resulted in home front subjects of various types being identified early in the WAAC's history as important for inclusion in the Committee's art collection. Such themes remained important to the Committee throughout the War.<sup>36</sup> Between one-fifth and one-quarter of all WAAC artworks focus primarily or exclusively upon themes (89%) and sitters (11%) within Britain.

The WAAC recognised that artists selling their work or fulfilling short-term contracts, rather than those employed as official war artists, were likely to account for a large percentage of representations of the home front.<sup>5</sup> Two-thirds of its collection of such themes were ultimately acquired through these means. Committee members therefore took early action to formulate policies for dealing with artists who wished to sketch or paint the many types of objects and sites covered by

---

<sup>5</sup> In addition to the four Ministry of War Transport official war artists, full-time artists also worked for the Ministry of Information to record subjects that fell under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Supply, the Ministry of Production and the Ministry of Home Security. The MoI artists were R.V. Pitchforth (munitions factories, shipbuilding, tank production), Graham Sutherland (foundries, tin mining, quarrying), John Piper (experimental shelters), and Mervyn Peake (production of cathode ray tubes).

the 10 September 1939 Control of Photography Order (No.1).<sup>6</sup> In order to sketch a single object, an artist applied to the General Officer Commander-in-Chief of the Command in which the object was located. If the artist wanted permission to sketch a variety of prohibited objects in several places, he or she could apply for a permit issued by the Ministry of Information, through the Central Institute of Art and Design.<sup>37</sup> The WAAC further reserved to itself the right to recommend that special facilities, beyond the mere acquisition of a general sketching permit, be given to artists. This usually entailed giving the artist in question permission to visit precisely

---

<sup>6</sup> The Order restricted the sketching or photographing of "any fortification, battery, searchlight, listening post, or any other work of defence[;] any aerodrome or seaplane station[;] any assembly of HM forces[;] any barracks, encampment, or building occupied or in course of preparation for occupation by any of HM forces[;] any arsenal, factory, magazine or store for munitions of war, arms, equipment or supplies for any of HM forces, whether completed or in course of construction[;] any wireless, telegraph, telephone, signal or cable station[;] any dock, caisson, dockyard, harbour, shipbuilding works or loading pier[;] any vessel of war either complete or under construction or any vessel or vehicle engaged in the transport of supplies or personnel[;] any aircraft or the wreckage of any aircraft[;] any building structure, vessel or other object damaged by enemy action or as a result of steps taken to repel enemy action[;] any hospital, or station at which casualties, whether civil or otherwise are treated; any ambulance or convoy of injured persons, or any injured person[;] any electricity, gas or water works, or any gas meter or reservoir, or any oil store[;] any assembly of persons for the purpose of transport or evacuation, or any temporary camp or other accommodation or transport vehicles used for the purpose of evacuation[;] any riotous or disorderly assembly, or premises, or other objects damaged in the course of such an assembly[; and] any roads or railways exclusively connected with works of defence." Slight modifications were made to these restrictions in subsequent versions of the Order, none of them substantial. A copy of the Order may be found in MoI (in PRO): INF 1/180.

specified factories, Armed Forces installations and other protected places, for limited periods of time.

Security, however, was a constant concern. In February 1941, for example, the Admiralty announced its intention to restrict the conditions under which permits were issued by the MoI, because "there had been cases in which holders of the Permits had made detailed sketches which might be a source of danger."<sup>38</sup> This situation had led to anxiety that, if too many other artists were approved for special facilities, relations between local authorities and the Committee's artists might be jeopardised. The number of such recommendations was therefore reduced, and artists who did receive them were informed that they were expected to submit the resulting drawings and paintings to the WAAC for possible purchase.<sup>39</sup> In 1944 the MoI announced that in future only artists who were dependent upon their art for most of their income, or who had been commissioned to do work in the national interest, would be given permits. Bernard Casson, although he had already sold to the WAAC several pictures based on things seen at sites where facilities had been arranged for him, was only one of many who were adversely affected by this ruling.<sup>40</sup>

However, whether or not they were armed with sketching permits and access to facilities, artists suffered from the same backlash of public fears about spies that had plagued their First World War counterparts. Edmond Kapp, sketching in the London Underground when it was being used for shelter

during the Blitz, was informed (to his surprise, as well as that of the WAAC and the MoI) that he was required to have a permit issued not by the Ministry, but by the London Passenger Transport Board. At the end of 1940 Oskar Kokoschka was refused a permit to paint St. Paul's Cathedral, on the grounds that he was a foreigner, albeit a refugee. The Hungarian Joseph Bato had his permit recalled in 1941 for the same reason.<sup>41</sup> Kenneth Rowntree was not a foreigner, but he discovered that local defence authorities adopted a belligerent attitude towards him, no matter how many permits he was able to produce, because he was a conscientious objector. Paul Methuen, an Army Captain, also had trouble with policemen and concerned citizens, despite carrying a valid permit and wearing his uniform. Admiralty artist John Nash was arrested when local policemen did not recognise his WAAC-approved uniform (that of an honorary Captain). Keith Vaughan was one of several other artists to be incarcerated, in his case for eight days because he had sketched a trench "in what looked suspiciously like a Cézanne code."<sup>42</sup>

These events - frustrating though they were for the artists - did not discourage the WAAC from seeking out new subjects. In this it had the benefit not only of the expertise of representatives from three relevant Ministries (Home Security, Supply, and Production<sup>7</sup>), but also the advice of other organi-

---

<sup>7</sup> The Ministry of Home Security was represented on the Committee beginning in November 1939. The Ministry of Supply sent a representative from February 1940 until October 1942.

sations and government departments. The Director of the Imperial War Museum, for example, was told to feel free to submit ideas for filling subject gaps in the war art collection. In 1941 the WAAC approached the Ministry of Health to ask for suggestions regarding particularly interesting hospital subjects, after Kenneth Clark had been gently upbraided by Lady Mountbatten (the head of the St. John Ambulance Brigade) about a lack of representations of hospital activities. The Women's Voluntary Services, too, complained (in 1943) that the work of its members was too-little represented in war art exhibitions. Like the WVS, the BBC was successful in interesting the Committee in its work, but other institutions (including the BOAC, the Great Ormond Street Children's Hospital, and the Office of Commissioners of Crown Lands) were not. The WAAC also benefited from the 1942 decision of the Director of the Civil Defence Camouflage Establishment to inaugurate a scheme to allow artists working under him at Leamington Spa to have one month off with pay for the purpose of making drawings and paintings of camouflage activities, for submission to the War Artists' Advisory Committee. Other Civil Defence authorities (such as the National Fire Service) were encouraged, by the Committee, to follow the Camouflage Establishment's example.<sup>43</sup>

Thus, through a combination of cooperating with other

---

Beginning in November 1942 he was replaced by a representative from the Ministry of Production, the latter ministry having subsumed the MoS within itself.



organisations, encouraging civilians to submit art for purchase, and working with the CIAD to facilitate artists' work through the issuing of sketching permits, the WAAC accumulated images reflecting a cross-section of life in Britain during the years 1939-1945. These included records of bomb damage, the work of the fire services, MoHS control rooms and facilities, camouflage, munitions and weapons production, shipbuilding, aircraft construction, agricultural labour, mining, the activities of the Local Defence Volunteers (later renamed the Home Guard),<sup>8</sup> "women's work" of many types, and much else.

The WAAC's interest in armaments production subjects (illustration 9) reflected concern that had been growing since the mid-1930's, regarding the need for rearmament in reaction to what was believed to be the existence of huge stockpiles of German weapons. The government's campaign to publicise factory work amongst unemployed civilians was given so much attention by film-makers and newspapers that historian John Stevenson

---

<sup>8</sup> The WAAC's assignment of War Office artist Edward Ardizzone to produce more than half of the records of the work of the Home Guard guaranteed that "Dad's Army" - already the butt of numerous jokes about its well-meaning ineffectiveness - would be further satirised in the war art collection. The WAAC usually preferred to give contracts to artists who had personal experience of the subjects to which they were assigned, but Ardizzone (unlike Eric Kennington, Henry Moore, Gilbert Spencer, Graham Sutherland and others) was not a member of the Guard. The probability that the WAAC was attempting to poke fun at the Home Guard is postulated in Meirion and Susie Harries, The War Artists: British Official War Art of the Twentieth Century (London: Michael Joseph, in association with the Imperial War Museum and the Tate Gallery, 1983), pp.222-223.

has claimed that news about "the battle for production" received "almost as much prominence as the military struggle."<sup>44</sup> Even so the situation was serious during the first two years of the War. Between September 1939 and the end of 1941 the Ministry of Supply suffered from a shortage of labour, with Royal Ordnance filling factories being particularly severely affected.

In November 1940 "the battle for production" came to the WAAC. In that month W.D. Sturch, the MoS representative on the Committee, apparently motivated by the hope that sufficiently attractive paintings of factories and factory employees would attract more of the population into armaments production, suggested Royal Ordnance filling factories as good candidates for pictures. (The materials used in filling factories discoloured the skin, and Sturch accompanied his suggestion with the proviso that "to exhibit pictures showing workers with yellow hands and green faces would not help recruiting."<sup>45</sup>) Also significant was Sturch's recommendation that the WAAC take special notice of the importance of the work being done in factories by women.<sup>46</sup> Women constituted the principal target audience of the Ministry of Supply's campaign to increase the numbers of factory employees.

The concerns of the MoS seem to have had the desired effect on the members of the WAAC. By November 1941 Kenneth Clark was musing about the benefits that would accrue from devoting an entire room of the National Gallery exhibition to

MoS subjects. As late as May 1942 he was still worried that his Committee had commissioned and purchased far too few pictures of production work (although even then such pictures were among the most numerous of the WAAC's home front scenes). The WAAC subsequently obtained financial sanction from the MoI to send Hubert Wellington (an art critic and the retired Principal of the Edinburgh College of Art) on tours of Britain in search of factories where important work was being done, and where the activities would readily lend themselves to visual records that would be both attractive and easily understood by the layperson.<sup>47</sup> In 1943 the WAAC representative from the Ministry of Production favoured the acquisition of yet more factory scenes and portraits, this time as part of a campaign to mollify production workers whose unhappiness with their working conditions was resulting in a worrisome proliferation of strikes.<sup>48</sup> Of the factory pictures commissioned by the Committee in that year, Percy Horton's Blind Workers in a Birmingham Factory was one in which the subject, by suggesting that even the severely handicapped could make a useful contribution to war production, seemed particularly appropriate to the Ministry of Production's purposes.

The WAAC thus came to define itself as a tool within a campaign, especially during the period 1939-1942, to encourage more civilians to become involved in factory work and to consider themselves to be making a vital contribution to the prosecution of the War. This, however, was about as far as the

Committee was ever to venture into what more conservative officials at the Ministry of Information could describe as art being used as a tool of persuasion. For other home front subjects the war art collection tended to confirm certain general underlying ideals, beliefs and expectations rather than attempting to mould or direct public attention in comparatively explicit ways. These can best be explored through the examination of three of the most frequently-depicted subjects: bomb damage, women's work, and land work.

Although the Ministry of Home Security was originally hostile to the idea of the WAAC giving artists contracts to make drawings and paintings of bomb damage (illustrations 6-8), these works eventually accounted for more than 15% of all home front pictures (i.e., more than any other single subject, including portraiture). The omnipresence of bomb damage, and the severity of the disruption that it occasioned - (not until September 1941 did deaths of British combatants outnumber those of civilians killed by enemy action<sup>49</sup>) - ensured it a prominent place in the WAAC's mandate. As late as 1943 Stephen Spender could still state flatly, "In this war, by 'War Pictures' we mean, pre-eminently, paintings of the Blitz. In the last war we would have meant pictures of the Western Front."<sup>50</sup> (The Blitz had occurred two years earlier. Similarly, Fires Were Started, one of Humphrey Jennings' most sophisticated contributions to the concept of national solidarity, was not

made until 1943.) Anthony Gross agreed with Spender, claiming that pictures of bomb damage in London constituted the best demonstration of the potential for the War to be a source of inspiration to his contemporaries.<sup>51</sup>

The heavy representation of air raid damage also meshed with the WAAC's attempt to galvanise the population into a fully integrated unit determined to resist German aggression. This the artworks accomplished, in part, by reminding viewers that massed aerial attacks against cities had actually strengthened civilian morale. After the first (September 1940) bombing of Buckingham Palace, the air raids had even helped to level class divisions which were otherwise inflamed by the disproportionate damage suffered by the East End of London during much of the Blitz. ("I'm glad we've been bombed," announced the Queen. "It makes me feel I can look the East End in the face."<sup>52</sup>) The WAAC responded to the symbolic importance of the 1940 and 1941 attacks on the Palace by issuing a contract to Walter Bayes to record them in a large oil painting. Bayes in turn heightened the interest of the scene by adopting a vantage point looking down on the Palace, and by combining temporally unrelated events: the Palace being bombed, and two enemy aircraft being shot down.<sup>53</sup>

The Battle of Britain also had the potential to promote national solidarity by emphasising that (unlike the situation during the First World War) the home population was not emotionally alienated from servicemen abroad. First World War

soldiers had complained that their feelings were understood not by family and friends in Britain, but by enemy soldiers. This sentiment was rare in 1939-1945, and the WAAC's bomb damage pictures acted as constant reminders of this fact. Similarly, the sense of the Battle of Britain as an event that united the country through the geographical scope of its destructiveness was reflected in the fact that the WAAC acquired representations of bomb damage in some twenty-five cities and towns throughout the country. It would have been a great deal easier for the Committee to have concentrated its resources upon cities in which destruction could have been chronicled more easily by artists who were already on the spot, and who had a particular interest in bomb damage as a subject. Instead, the WAAC kept artists on standby, ready to make often lengthy train journeys to record fresh bomb damage in places where war artists were not thick on the ground. Randolph Schwabe, for example - one of the artists most favoured by the WAAC for the production of drawings of bombed buildings - was sent to Coventry to record the ruins of the Cathedral immediately after the structure had been destroyed.

Aside from contributing to national solidarity in the various ways described above, representations of bomb damage could also foster an interest in British culture and history as things worth understanding and defending, especially at a time when interest in literature, music and art was becoming increasingly widespread. Exeter Cathedral, for example, sur-

vived the 1942 Baedeker raids intact, but the symbolism of its near destruction, and the result that the latter had on the residents of the city, was summarised by William Clause in his painting A Fire Guard Team, Exeter (illustration 8). Clause declined to make the three firemen in the foreground look like anything other than unremarkable members of the community posed in front of the Cathedral, which they had apparently just saved from destruction. The relationship of the figures to the Cathedral is one of undemonstrative protectiveness, and emphasises the increasingly widespread interest of the population in the symbols of its shared cultural heritage. The same implications could be given even in views of historic buildings that had been destroyed. In Stephen Spender's consideration,

...There is something that is dead and inhibiting about a tradition that lives on without being appreciated. It is right that Londoners should have derived a sense of the greatness of Wren's architecture from the destruction of the city churches.<sup>54</sup>

Views of historic buildings in ruins thus reinforced a sense of nationhood and historical tradition; but in another sense they bolstered support for the War by emphasising the theme of the discrepancy between British moral right and German moral degeneracy. Focusing the bomb damage pictures on historic buildings in general, and on churches in particular, expedited the interpretation of the War as a confrontation

between humane civilisation and unthinking barbarism. Roughly one-third of the pictures of bombed or burnt buildings in London alone show churches, and another 15% feature other damaged landmarks: the House of Commons, Goldsmith's Hall, the Guildhall and the Old Bailey. St. Paul's Cathedral is the principal point of interest in no less than eight pictures. No other building in all of Britain was more thoroughly recorded for the WAAC, and only one (significantly, the Houses of Parliament, following a destructive air raid) became the subject of as many works. Although Robert Herring objected that the information media's emphasis on bombed buildings of these types incorrectly implied that "the outraged reactions of World War I were still applicable," he found few supporters.<sup>55</sup> More typical was the enthusiastic critical response that greeted Muirhead Bone's drawing St. Bride's and the City After the Fire (illustration 6). The large dimensions of this drawing (77 7/8" x 44 1/8") ensured that its subject (the ruins of St. Bride's, and the still-intact St. Paul's) would assume iconic status. So valuable were such works deemed to be that Kenneth Clark, acting on a suggestion from the Ministry of Information, even proposed to publish a postcard showing a John Piper drawing of the ruins of Coventry Cathedral, accompanied by a verse about how the destruction of monuments served to emphasise the justness of the Allies' cause.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Thank God for war and fire  
 To burn the silly objects of desire  
 That from the ruin of a church thrown down



For all the reasons noted above, the WAAC recognised that representations of bomb damage were potential catalysts for national unity. The Committee therefore made a point of having the results of air raids recorded in different styles that, in their variety, appealed to a cross-section of tastes. Some of the resulting pictures of bombed buildings were works of meticulous draughtsmanship (by such artists as Randolph Schwabe, Dennis Flanders and Muirhead Bone) that recorded "the original excellence of the architecture" with great fidelity. Others were more imaginative pictures (notably by Graham Sutherland, John Piper and John Armstrong) that emphasised the romanticism of bomb damage.<sup>56</sup> Thus, no matter how specialised the individual tastes of viewers of war art might be, each viewer would be able to find at least some representations of the aerial war to which he or she would be attracted. The Battle of Britain was probably the central event in the home population's experience of the War, and in the WAAC's art collection of home front scenes it therefore held pride of place.

"Women's work" comprises a second broad category within which examination yields telling evidence about the ideas and ideals being promoted by the WAAC's war records. One of the most striking overall characteristics of the portraits (of both civilians and Armed Forces personnel) is its underestimation of women as individual contributors to the war effort.

---

We see God clear and high above the town.

Instead, women come into their own in theme-based pictures. The presence of women is the principal point of interest in roughly 10% of home front pictures other than portraits. These images imply certain problematic assumptions that can best be approached by considering the status of civilian women during the Second World War.

Approximately two million women entered the civilian work force during the War. Four-fifths of them had never been employed in any capacity outside of the home.<sup>57</sup> Many now took jobs either as replacements for men who had been relocated to new types of work, or (especially in the Armed Services) as support personnel. They were, therefore, frequently viewed as temporary and ancillary members of the work force.

This was probably a factor contributing to their depiction, in WAAC art, as members of teams engaged in typical examples of "women's work" rather than as individuals sufficiently important in and of themselves to merit having their features recorded in portraits.

Seen primarily as members of a group, it was appropriate that women should be memorialised in pictures that tended to deny them individuality by submerging them in scenes in which the only important fact about the actors was their gender. The principal point of interest in the tasks they performed was not that the work was being done by specific individuals, but rather that it was being done by women, and especially that this state of affairs was unusual and temporary.<sup>58</sup> Outstanding

individual talent or initiative was not routinely expected in jobs performed by women. In 1942, for example, Kenneth Clark argued in favour of the acquisition of more depictions of women doing such "odious," "depressing" and "dirty" jobs as working in citizens' advice bureaux and British Restaurants.<sup>59</sup> However, when women did manifest qualities of marked talent or initiative, they might gain a degree of fame far beyond that which would accrue to men showing the same qualities in the performance of the same tasks. Such was the case with Ruby Loftus, a young machinist in a Monmouthshire Royal Ordnance Factory, who defied all expectations about women's abilities to perform a particularly difficult manufacturing skill. She gained national fame as a result, and in 1943 became the subject of one of the WAAC's most highly-finished and expensive oil paintings: Laura Knight's Ruby Loftus Screwing a Breech-ring (illustration 9).

Thus, despite its best intentions, the WAAC contributed to the ironic fact that women emerged from the Second World War in a much weaker state than their wartime contribution indicated that they wanted or deserved. The Committee's views of home front subjects acknowledged the role of women in the war effort, but tended to envisage women as constituting a group that performed essential (but temporary and/or replacement) types of work that yielded up comparatively few of its members into positions of such responsibility that their identities as individuals became of paramount interest. This

view was reinforced by the WAAC's treatment of female artists. As noted in Chapter 3, Evelyn Dunbar was the only woman to become an official war artist, and women accounted for only 10.5% of the artists who were given short-term contracts (although they significantly outnumbered men who were resident in Britain, most short-term contracts being offered to men and women who were in Britain rather than abroad).<sup>10</sup> Perhaps most telling, however, were the works of art that those contracts required: two-thirds of them were for portraits of women or for pictures of "women's work." Just as the pictures themselves often imply limitations upon the types of contributions women could and should make to the War, so the contracts put limitations upon the types of subjects female artists could most successfully be expected to record.

This view of women's contribution to the War helps to explain the initially puzzling zeal of the WAAC for securing representations of agricultural and other farm-based work (illustration 11). Approximately sixty of the drawings, prints and paintings of home front activities, show aspects of farm work, one-third of them focusing exclusively upon the Women's Land Army. These were commissioned and purchased from some twenty artists, notably James Bateman, Evelyn Dunbar, Charles Ginner, Thomas Hennell, Nora Lavrin and Mona Moore. Though apparently not particularly large (in an art collection num-

---

<sup>10</sup> See Appendix 1, Part 2.

bering 6000 items), this total of sixty works exceeded those for all other home front subjects with the sole exceptions of bomb damage, portraits, munitions production, and sheltering. It is important to note that virtually none of these views were acquired unintentionally, from official war artists who executed them as incidental components of larger mandates. The only official war artist to make pictures of land work was Evelyn Dunbar, but her contract clearly specified that she was to concern herself with agricultural subjects.

Agricultural production was not only better-chronicled than such apparently obvious subjects as shipbuilding, aircraft construction and fire-fighting; it was also more thoroughly documented than all other natural resources subjects (mining, quarrying, oil refining, fishing and lumbering) combined. Yet, as Kenneth Clark acknowledged in 1943 (fully three years after A.S. Hartrick had become the first artist to be given a WAAC contract for land work subjects), agricultural pursuits were very difficult to make look like anything other than peacetime activities.<sup>60</sup> In this regard the WAAC's intentional accumulation of so many representations of land work requires further explanation.

The enforced reliance of Britain upon its own agricultural and other forms of land-based production during the War was an obvious reason for the Committee's interest, although as an explanation for the substantial extent of that interest it is perhaps insufficient. Another explanation, as noted

above, involves the existence of the Women's Land Army. Inclusion of members of the Land Army in several of the agriculture pictures served the dual purposes of giving otherwise peaceful subjects an obvious topicality vis-à-vis the War, and of providing an opportunity to record another variety of women's work.

Probably more important, however, was the fact that, as a theme, agricultural life offered a rural counterpart to urban bomb damage in the establishment of a basis for national solidarity, uniqueness of identity and sense of historical continuity. Even in the 1930's and 1940's, Britain's essential qualities and its basis of social and political organisation were defined as being intimately associated with the soil and the countryside. Michael Ayrton went so far as to claim that these were also the sources of British art, and of the nation's position at the forefront of Western culture.<sup>61</sup> The interwar preoccupation with walking and motoring holidays (the latter planned using the 1930's Shell County Guides) had spread interest in rural life amongst members of the middle and upper classes.

Once the War had begun, the exodus into the countryside of urban populations - whether for work or refuge - extended familiarity with rural life and the appreciation of it as a relatively safe haven. (As David Mellor has pointed out, "Pastoral settings [in war art], whether bucolic, as in [W.T.] Monnington's Tempests Attacking Flying Bombs or sinister, like

Paul Nash's Totes Meer (Dead Sea) had the power to neutralise violence and destruction inside the containing idyll of the British countryside."<sup>62</sup>) Neo-Romantic artists defined the landscape as a protective, regenerative Eden, or as a setting for remnants of prehistoric and medieval Britain. Churchill relied upon references to rural stability, along with other symbols of tradition, to weld the country into a cohesive unit. Even J.B. Priestley (whose Postscripts were banned from the BBC in 1941 by the Prime Minister because Priestley's opinions about politics and society were deemed unacceptable) was a defender of the old-world values of the farm and village against urban industrialism and cultural standardisation. Ten of his seventeen talks included references to the joys of rural life.<sup>63</sup>

These concepts were reinforced by the descriptive and travel books of John Betjeman (English Cities and Small Towns, 1943; English, Scottish and Welsh Landscape, 1700-c.1860, 1944), by the novels and reminiscences of C. Henry Warren (England is a Village, 1941) and H.V. Morton (I Saw Two Englands, 1942), and by the 1940's two most widely-read histories of Britain, both of which were anti-industrial in orientation (Arthur Bryant's English Saga (1840-1940) and G.M. Trevelyan's English Social History, published in 1940 and 1942, respectively). The cult of the countryside also encompassed the rise of tradition-rooted cultural nationalism, as in Nikolaus Pevsner's 1942 Birkbeck College lecture series, The Englishness of

English Art. The message was spread to an even wider audience by such popular magazines as Vogue and Picture Post during the traumatic summer of 1940. For example, the text for a July 1940 Picture Post photo essay claimed, "Any moment now, the war may come to the villages of Britain. The villages which are Britain. The villages on whose resistance civilization itself depends."<sup>64</sup> When, a year later, a national Mass-Observation poll asked the question "What does Britain mean to you?," the overwhelming majority of respondents spoke of rural areas, several explicitly identifying these - not cities - as the essence of the "real" England.<sup>65</sup> The same sentiments also underlay the Recording Britain project, one of the principal purposes of which was to evoke "a sense of the historical continuity of the English town or village."<sup>66</sup> The Ministry of Information itself promoted the countryside as an essential constituent element of British identity, by means of publications, posters and films.<sup>67</sup> (Frank Newbould's 1942 contribution to the Ministry's Your Britain: Fight for it Now series of posters - a panoramic arcadian view of a man and his dog walking through the rolling hills of South Devon - was markedly reminiscent of similar themes from First World War poster campaigns.) The same assumptions were presented by such filmmakers as Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger. Exemplary in this regard is A Canterbury Tale (1944), in which history and nature are so conflated that some of the rural characters actually hear the sounds of the past. These characters, and



the close-knit nature of their town, echoed in miniature the WAAC's implied qualities of national unity and purpose.<sup>68</sup>

Public interest in the land was thus extensive in scope. It was manifested in the several recommendations to the WAAC (from journals, newspapers and private citizens) that war-induced changes in farm life should be recorded by artists.<sup>69</sup> The Committee responded favourably to these requests. It is significant, however, that the WAAC's view of rural Britain in wartime did not emphasise the exploitation of high technology and/or large-scale production that had already been a feature of much British agriculture for some time, and that was of obvious importance during the War. Instead, artists tended to focus on the smaller, more rustic subjects that Thomas Hennell (one of the artists who sold views of agricultural activity to the Committee) had been dealing with during the 1930's. In addition, human figures are portrayed as being at home on the land, even if they had had little exposure to it before the War. Ethel Gabain's 1940 lithograph of London schoolgirls playing happily in the rural area to which they had been evacuated was paired with another Gabain print showing London schoolboys who had also been removed from the capital. When they were exhibited at the National Gallery the prints were accompanied by texts suggesting that at least some of these children would probably return to the countryside later in life to take up farming - the work of their ancestors - as a profession.

Rural subjects could function not only to identify British qualities and values, but also to distinguish them from those of Nazi Germany. Just as the WAAC based much of its conception of war art as propaganda upon a juxtaposition of tolerant and dispassionate British culture against the German debasement of the arts made subservient to state propaganda, so contemporary writers contrasted the "real" England (rural and rooted in tradition) to the "real" Germany (urban and over-industrialised). The wartime dispersal of such Neo-Romantic artists as Cecil Collins, John Minton, John Piper and Ceri Richards to rural regions was described at the time as a "sign of our free condition," consciously set against the centralised regimentation of Nazi society.<sup>70</sup> Thus the War could be (and was) characterised as a symbolic struggle between the quiet, enduring values of the countryside against the hysteria of modern technological development.<sup>71</sup> In such a portrayal, images of the life of rural Britain had a key role to play, regardless of how obscure their immediate thematic connection to the War itself might seem to be. Indeed, much of the effectiveness of land subjects could be seen to derive from their quality of being separated from the War, exemplifying the ability of tradition both to transcend and to give meaning to contemporary life.

Yet another example of the WAAC's presentation of a highly selective view of a wartime subject is evident in its sub-

stantial collection of more than eighty drawings and paintings of shelters and sheltering. Unlike land work, wartime representations of which could be difficult to distinguish from views done ten years earlier, sheltering was a widely-shared wartime experience. Yet the WAAC's record of this practice is very discriminating in its emphases.

The government initially disapproved of the London Underground being used as a night shelter, although it subsequently arranged for bunk beds to be installed and for conditions in all public shelters to be made more sanitary. However, the visual records of both the Underground and other shelters do not chronicle the results of those efforts, but exploit instead the impressions and qualities suggested by shelters in their ruder states. Henry Moore, for example, concentrated, in his drawings, on what Alex Comfort called the need for a "nurturing human being-ness," and "alliance for mutual aid of all human beings, against a universe which does not exist for their comfort."<sup>72</sup> Conversely, Edmond Kapp's and Edward Ardizzone's drawings (illustration 12) of above-ground shelter interiors accentuate the casual informality of bodies sitting (or often sprawling) in unlikely proximity to one another. Here the accent is not on an abstracted presentation of human unity under duress, but rather on the celebration of the sense of good-natured cooperation across boundaries of social regulation that (as contemporary journalists repeatedly observed), seemed to be replacing the stereotypical British aloofness

with a new openness and solidarity. Minister of Health Malcolm MacDonald recommended in 1940 that life in the shelters should be recorded by artists "before they [the shelters] get too tidied up with bunks etc.,"<sup>73</sup> and certainly the drawings by Moore, Ardizzone and Kapp received sufficient critical and public praise to suggest that the WAAC had done well to reach the same conclusion. Opinion polls taken at war art exhibitions revealed a predisposition, on the part of visitors, to favour pictures of people sleeping in shelters, as well as other "similar 'human' subjects."<sup>74</sup> The MoI, too, conceded the positive impact of these works, and described Ardizzone's drawings in particular as singularly effective examples of art as propaganda.<sup>75</sup>

In other cases the WAAC's choices of subjects were as significant for what they minimised or omitted as for what they emphasised. All but a very few serious physical injuries and instances of public panic were ignored by the Committee. Carel Weight's painting It Happened To Us, an eye-witness scene of trolley passengers fleeing an attack by a German airplane, was rejected, and Weight was urged to produce a painting of a more acceptable example of panic: frightened zebras escaping from a zoo during an air raid.<sup>76</sup> Similarly, in 1940 Frances Macdonald was requested to visit the Secretary of the Committee to discuss altering the looks of apprehension on the faces of people included in her picture of an air raid

shelter.<sup>77</sup> (Apprehension is not a reaction easily found on the faces of the shelterers in Ardizzone's popular drawings, and this accounted in large part for the MoI's favourable opinion of his work.)

Clark and his colleagues also did not opt to include in their large collection of air raid and bomb damage pictures any representations of the nightly "treks" of civilians out of target cities. As for the massive undertaking to evacuate mothers and children from urban areas, the WAAC took a difficult situation and gave it as cheerful an image as possible. The evacuation took place months before any bombs fell, and by the summer of 1940 many evacuees - bored and lonely in the countryside that the war artists were to record in such loving detail - had returned to the cities. Inter-class irritation during the evacuation also became a force with which to reckon. Many host families were horrified at the filthiness, illiteracy and poverty of their charges, and disgusted with the unwillingness of neighbours to adopt evacuees on a temporary basis. Worse, during the first months of the War an estimated two million citizens with sufficient financial resources privately spirited themselves away to quiet country retreats, or across the ocean to America.<sup>78</sup> Little wonder, then, that Ethel Gabain, commissioned in April 1940 to make lithographs of evacuation subjects, diplomatically limited herself to scenes redolent of happy children, kindly neighbours, and efficient organisation.

The underlying idealisations and generalisations in Gabain's prints, as well as in many of the Committee's other records of life in wartime Britain, were congenial, and were accepted even by most of the WAAC's harshest critics. Indeed, one of the most striking (and, in retrospect, incongruous) aspects of published criticism of the Committee is the almost complete absence of suggestions that, in the fields of home front portraits and miscellaneous subjects, its art collection was anything but objective and complete. Though not usually comprehended as being propagandist in intent, war art helped shape and confirm attractive attitudes, beliefs and expectations that the Ministry of Information - the Ministry concerned with publicity and propaganda - was anxious to promote.

#### Armed Forces Subjects

Beginning in the first year of the War, the acquisition and display of pictures of home front activities evoked some unfavourable reactions from critics and members of the public who wanted to see more war in war art. "I am afraid that I think the present show [of war art, at the National Gallery] just too pansy," complained Henry Carr in July 1940.<sup>79</sup> Three months later (i.e., well into the Battle of Britain), Lady Norman voiced the same disappointment with the exhibition as a pictorial record.<sup>80</sup> By then the MoI itself had threatened to

slash the funds that were acquired for the Committee on the Ministry's Vote, on the grounds that "a substantial portion of the grant is being expended on records of an unwarlike character."<sup>11</sup> The following year (1941) Walter Bayes submitted an action-filled picture accompanied by an unenthusiastic letter. "... I am sadly aware," he wrote, "that it [his painting] looks a bit optimistic - almost as if the painter fancied we might sometime win the War - whereas your collection mainly suggests that our part in it is to bear with fortitude the horrid things Hitler does to us."<sup>81</sup> In 1942 Sir Charles ffoulkes (a Trustee of the Imperial War Museum) volunteered the opinion that the National Gallery exhibition would be much improved by the inclusion of fewer portraits and more "factual" pictures.<sup>82</sup>

Among the official war artists who contributed the most battle pictures were Eric Ravilious (with the Admiralty in the waters around Britain and off Norway and Iceland in 1940-1942), Stephen Bone (who, with Anthony Gross, recorded the Normandy invasion on D-Day), Albert Richards (who chronicled the progress of the Army across northern France after the invasion), and John Worsley (present at the naval battles that supported the invasion of Sicily and Italy). However, action

---

<sup>11</sup> By 3 July 1940 £4633.5s of the £5000 allocated to the WAAC by the MoI had been spent: £205.16s on land work subjects, £328.13s on Home Security subjects, £609.5s on themes that fell under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Supply, £3110.15s on the Armed Services themes, and £408.1s on miscellaneous subjects (E.M.O'R. Dickey to Kenneth Clark, 28 August 1940 (GP/72/D(1))).

subjects by these artists are heavily outnumbered by "peaceful" Armed Forces pictures by war artists as a whole. Few of the drawings and paintings that could be described as recording Services events show actual battle. There are a number of views of the results of battle (i.e., wreckage; see illustrations 15), but most of the pictures that claim to be associated with battle itself might easily be mistaken for scenes of mere confusion or bustle were it not for their titles. For example, the aircraft depicted in illustration 14, Charles Cundall's Stirling Bomber Aircraft: Take-off at Sunset, are about to participate in a night raid; but here, as in many other pieces of war art, such information is not at all immediately apparent. Artists not involved in producing portraits or pictures of the home front gave most of their attention either to recording Forces personnel engaged in routine activities or relaxing, or to making drawings and paintings of the variety of equipment and facilities - from kits to aerodromes - associated with the Army, Navy and Air Force. Ardizzone's Soldiers Waiting to be Admitted to a Papal Audience ([1945]), Stephen Bone's LCT at Courseulles: Unloading Beer ([1944]), Anthony Gross' ATS Trainees Listening to a Lecture on the Gear Box and the Clutch (1941) and Leonard Rosoman's A Radar Predictor ([1945]) are typical.

The WAAC objected repeatedly to this situation, but its protests must be treated with at least a slight degree of skepticism. For example, the Committee accepted only with re-



luctance <sup>to</sup> oil paintings (by Norman Wilkinson) showing the sinking of the Bismarck, and purchased a drawing of the sinking ship from another artist only after the latter's impressive social connections were brought (with some force) to the members' attention. The only picture with a subject that was relevant to the sinking, and that was acquired without protest by the Committee, was a portrait, by G. Geary, of the sailor who had sighted the Bismarck. In addition, the examples (cited above) of Carel Weight and Frances Macdonald being requested to delete from their paintings evidence of public panic (a part of most people's experience), suggests that the WAAC was not at all eager to acquire images that were truly nasty. Indeed, Richard Eurich's Survivors from a Torpedoed Ship was actually removed from exhibition at the National Gallery because of Admiralty objections that it would discourage enlistment in the Merchant Marine. It also seems significant that, of all the war artists, only Leslie Cole (first in Malta in 1943, and later in Greece and Germany) showed a pronounced interest in the horrific, culminating in his oil paintings at the Belsen concentration camp (illustration 20).

Clearly, then, there were bounds of restraint beyond which an official record of the War was not encouraged to go. Carel Weight spent much of his time in Italy in 1945-1946 (as an official war artist with the War Office) painting scenes from art classes. Edward Bawden, sent to Africa to sketch troops, lived and worked in areas where troops were forbidden

to go.<sup>83</sup> Most of Anthony Gross' work chronicled the boredom and camaraderie of soldiers' lives abroad. Edward Ardizzone, who served as an official artist to the War Office from 1940 through to 1945 and who spent much of that time in battle zones abroad, later admitted, "I feel strongly about the illustration of violence. Often suggestion is enough."<sup>84</sup> So, apparently, did the censor, who refused to pass Ardizzone's watercolours showing burials in North Africa.

However, the WAAC did make a series of sincere complaints about a general lack of action pictures that were not horrific. It attempted to facilitate the production of such views by encouraging official war artists to get as close to combat as possible, and by expediting their freedom of movement in the field by convincing the Admiralty and the War Office to bestow honorary ranks.<sup>12</sup> The Admiralty made Muirhead Bone an honorary Major in the Royal Marines, and in February 1940 the Second Sea Lord agreed that all other official Admiralty artists would be given honorary commissions as Royal Marine Captains.<sup>85</sup> The War Office gave its artists the same status as war correspondents, without honorary rank, but decided after Dunkirk to make them honorary Captains. This was in response to complaints from Edward Ardizzone, Edward Bawden and Barnett Freedman, three of its official war artists in 1940. ("I think

---

<sup>12</sup> Air Ministry artists were not given honorary rank at any point during the War, but in 1943 the Air Ministry Establishments Division did propose that in the event of injuries its artists should be treated as being equivalent to Flight Lieutenants.

it was a mistake not to give us ... honorary rank," Freedman wrote in April. The local authorities in France had been kind and helpful, but "the amount of questioning and bewilderment our blind uniform causes is awful."<sup>86</sup> Once they had been given their new ranks, artists were instructed to travel at the direction of local Public Relations officers, although in practice they frequently lost touch with these authorities - usually through their own initiative. Bawden, active mostly in the Middle East, ignored the travel ruling because "enough time was wasted waiting for transport and being stuck in places which I didn't really want to be in."<sup>87</sup> Ardizzone moved around Europe and North Africa in a "delightfully unofficial" way, and eventually made an entirely unplanned (by the War Office) arrival in Sicily with the main invasion force.<sup>88</sup>

Yet despite the official war artists' instructions to take risks, and the sanctioned and unsanctioned provisions for facilitating their ease of movement, a belief existed throughout the War that the lack of "truly warlike" subjects in the WAAC's exhibitions was due primarily to the Committee's policy of selecting a few artists, removing or exempting them from service in the Armed Forces, and issuing them with contracts as quasi-civil servants.<sup>89</sup> The issue of exempting artists from conscription so that they could accept positions as official war artists was therefore hotly debated. Most of the art press adopted the position that although artists as a class should not be exempted, cases could be made for the release of speci-

fic individuals whose work could be expected (as the Editor of The Studio phrased it) to act as "a stimulus to the imagination, to pride in achievement, to growth of the spirit - and an incentive to greater effort."<sup>90</sup>

Opponents of exemption claimed either that it was unfair (especially if they held that "art is essentially an amateur affair, a recreation, not a profession"<sup>91</sup>), that it was pointless (unless the art seemed immediately useful as propaganda or for the maintenance of morale<sup>92</sup>), or that it was unrealistic (if the goal was to acquire battle scenes from artists who were only informally associated with the actions of the Armed Services). The latter argument was a potent one for critics of "peaceful" pictures, who could argue that the First World War art of a small number of young painters (notably C.R.W. Nevinson, Eric Kennington, John and Paul Nash, and William Roberts) who had had combat experience in battle zones, constituted the definitive treatment of the 1914-1918 conflict.<sup>93</sup>

In this regard the potential existed for a causal connection to be postulated between much of the WAAC's war art, and the fact that (as noted in Chapter 3) only seven of the thirty-one men assigned to record the work of one or more of the Armed Services had had experience as enlisted personnel before accepting their contracts.<sup>13</sup> (The latter point, in itself, was not a matter of much concern to the WAAC. The

---

<sup>13</sup> See Appendix 1, Part 1.

Committee downplayed the importance of past experience in the Armed Forces because the official war artists were expected to get as close to the action as they safely could, or at least to spend much of their time in the company of soldiers, sailors and airmen who were on active duty.<sup>94</sup>) The most vocal opponents of the Committee on the issue of exemption were two of the First World War veterans and artists: Eric Kennington<sup>95</sup> and (especially) C.R.W. Nevinson. Nevinson first gained a platform in the press in December 1939, arguing, "You cannot expect to paint the war as an onlooker; you have to live it, and feel it, and be part of it yourself."<sup>96</sup>

Nevinson's and Kennington's arguments against exemption, though they became focal points of debate about the paucity of violence in war art, suffered from a crucial shortcoming. The WAAC itself recognised that there were many professional and amateur artists serving in the Armed Forces, and repeatedly stressed the desirability of buying pictures from them; yet the Committee discovered that these serving artists were not markedly more likely to exploit subjects that were clearly warlike than were the official war artists themselves. As Committee members concluded in 1941, "soldiers in general [... want] to draw subjects not connected with the war."<sup>97</sup> Typical in this regard was L.S. Lee, a Lieutenant in the Royal Army when he produced his drawing The Final of the Brigade Association Football Cup (illustration 13). Various contributing factors may be proposed to account for this state of affairs,

most of them being equally applicable to the official war artists.

Some artists and critics traced the problem to a supposed emphasis, in pre-war art, on sedate subjects, or on styles and/or training that could not be readily applied to the development of the quick-sketch skills that were essential under battle conditions.<sup>98</sup> Many serving personnel also blamed modern warfare itself. They pointed out that, especially for soldiers, it usually consisted of stretches of boredom relieved by sporadic bloodiness.<sup>99</sup> Under these circumstances artists who chronicled the mundane aspects of servicemen's daily lives often received high praise (both from the WAAC and from members of the Armed Services) for capturing the essence of life in the Army, Navy and Air Force abroad. Kenneth Clark, for example, explained the War Office's uninterrupted employment of Ardizzone from 1940 to 1945, by arguing, "When the war came and we had to find war artists, I wanted one who would show the earthy part, who would show what military life was really like."<sup>100</sup> In his five years as a War Office artist Ardizzone produced in excess of 150 paintings, drawings and watercolours which take British troops as their subjects. Three-quarters of these show soldiers relaxing, and most of the remainder show soldiers engaged in routine duties.

In addition, artists who wished to record more exciting events were hampered by a variety of regulations. In 1941, for example, the Admiralty required sailors who wished to sketch

on board ship to secure a permit from the local Naval authority at the point of departure,<sup>101</sup> and it is unclear how well-publicised this policy was. In the Army, limitations were imposed upon the weight of soldiers' kits. Essential kits, used in operations like the invasion of Sicily and Italy, were even more restricted in weight, thus making it difficult to carry art equipment into the most important military campaigns. War Office representative Colin Coote, always reluctant to intercede more often than was absolutely necessary in the affairs of Army units, told the other members of the WAAC that he was hostile towards the idea of artist-members of active-service units being authorised to have special kits. He also indicated that he regarded it as "extremely awkward even to make the suggestion" to commanding officers that artists with active-service units might be given WAAC contracts exempting them from daily duties in order to give them more time for their art.<sup>102</sup>

Censorship imposed additional restraints on what subjects could be sketched or painted.<sup>103</sup> Although one of the objectives formulated in May 1940 by the Ministry of Information's Home Morale Emergency Committee was "to convince the public that they are being given the news even when bad," the three Armed Services had earlier (October 1939) usurped the right to make the final decisions about censoring subjects within their areas of jurisdiction.<sup>104</sup> The Admiralty was the most recalcitrant, leading one of its own censors to complain later that

"it was seldom, if ever, that any naval news of real interest and[/]or importance was allowed to come out."<sup>105</sup> It is impossible to determine how many artists were told not to even begin sketching certain subjects, but the number was probably high, especially in the Navy and the Merchant Marine. Of the 271 WAAC works known to have prevented from being exhibited and/or reproduced (i.e., 4.5% of the total), approximately 56% show naval subjects, and several of these posed no security risk. For example, Stephen Bone's painting of the capsized HMS Breda was stopped by censors (one of approximately thirty of his Admiralty paintings to be stopped), as was Richard Eurich's Survivors from a Torpedoed Ship.

These factors (censorship; Armed Services restrictions on equipment and on sketching; infrequency of combat) are not the only ones to consider in accounting for the overwhelmingly peaceful character of the subjects favoured by the war artists. They fail to take into account other factors that made it not physically, but rather intellectually and emotionally difficult for artists to deal with the War as a subject. The most superficial of these were the personalities and interests of the artists themselves. Few had ever made violent themes central to their art in the past, and their employment by the WAAC does raise questions about the latter's degree of commitment to such subjects. However individual personality and interests - though a factor to consider - fails to account for the evident reluctance of all but a very few artists to con-



cern themselves with the brutal side of the War. Nor was selective vision of this type unique to artists. Press correspondents, radio broadcasters and film-makers could also be remarkably circumspect in what they were willing to describe. Clearly one must look for more deep-rooted and general explanations. One such was put forward by John Lehmann, who proposed that "the British, because heroism seems to come so naturally to so many of them, soon tire of heroics."<sup>106</sup> This is somewhat facile, but it does indicate that, in accounting for the scarcity of scenes of violence in WAAC art, the identification of widespread considerations and expectations is also important. Two proposals may be made in this regard.

The first involves what many contemporary and subsequent commentators (including several of the war poets<sup>107</sup>), referred to as the "invisible," and therefore "unpaintable," nature of the War. (Adjectives such as these recur throughout the artists' correspondence.<sup>108</sup>) The War moved at rapid speed, lacked a symbolic and static touchstone (a role assumed during the First World War by the trenches on the Western Front), and suffered from losses of clarity and detail in consequence of the great distances that frequently intervened between artists and their subjects. As a result, even in works that were intended as depictions of battle - Eric Ravillious' HMS Ark Royal in Action (illustration 16), for example - there may be little in the images themselves to corroborate their titles. The light that glows behind the Ark Royal is that of an ex-

ploding shell, but the artist's vantage point effectively hides the point of explosion from the viewer's sight, while the overall decorative patterning that characterises the surfaces of all of Ravilious' war works acts to draw attention to itself and away from the subject of the picture.

The War thus became a phenomenon in which battle scenes needed to be reconstructed and (to an extent) re-invented, rather than merely recorded. Indeed, the "invisibility" of the War was one of the WAAC's justifications for hiring artists rather than photographers to record it. Photographers were perforce limited to what they could capture through their cameras' viewfinders, whereas an artist could synthesise disparate events into cohesive and meaningful wholes. Yet this was difficult for many artists, especially given the difficulties involved in working in battle zones.

On occasions when the War ceased to be invisible, it often presented a spectacle that remained uncapturable by artists because the visual reality was too novel to be encompassed within the compositional rules and techniques under which most artists operated. It outstripped available pictorial as well as literary codes and conventions in much the same way that the physical strangeness of the Western Front during the First World War had inundated most artists and writers. Edward Ardizzone, for example, encountered difficulties in coming to terms with the unfamiliar expanse of the North African desert. "I used to sometimes wish I was at the

Battle of Waterloo," he later wrote, "...to do a picture which was paintable of troops in line charging."

The problem of applying pictorial codes and conventions to the War was not a significant one for the Admiralty's artists, since most of the action that they witnessed at sea could easily be accommodated within the compositional parameters established long before by naval painting as a genre. However, the extremely small proportion of battle scenes involving the RAF in particular may well have been due largely to the difficulty for many artists of establishing convincing compositional programmes into which aerial combat could be incorporated. Even familiarity with the view from a flying aircraft was insufficient in itself to guarantee that artists would be able to consolidate their experience of flight into their art. By the end of the War only two depictions of actual aerial combat as seen from the air had come into the possession of the WAAC from artists serving with the RAF (Flight-Lieutenant D. Barnham and Lieutenant J.A. Russell). Of the official war artists, only W.T. Monnington (assigned to cover Air Ministry subjects in his capacity as official war artist to the Ministry of Information) produced comparable compositions, and they constitute only a minority of his records of the RAF.

Just as the notion that the War was invisible merged with the idea that it was compositionally too novel to record in art, so did that latter merge with the concept of the War as

being too conceptually and emotionally unimaginable for art. Whereas Ardizzone found North Africa too foreign in a physical sense, he had difficulty sketching in the topographically familiar terrain of Sicily and Italy because the scenes he encountered there during the Allied invasion were too horrific. "Little to see and less to draw," he wrote, in reaction to a devastated village with corpses.<sup>109</sup> Similarly, Edward Bawden wrote to his wife from Cairo in August 1940 that "the great handicap [in producing drawings of the North African battles ... is] not physical as much as mental."<sup>110</sup> Art, as practised by most of the war artists, was conceived primarily as a humanist enterprise, in which human beings were centres of control. A conflict like the Second World War could not be easily accommodated within this paradigm.

For one thing, the War was extraordinarily complex in a technological sense. "It is all so gruesomely mechanical," lamented Apollo. "The soldier counts for so very little, the machine for so very much more."<sup>111</sup> The War was, in addition, essentially nihilist, rather than humanist, in essence, and thus seemed to many to be conceptually incompatible with art. Authors and critics who held this opinion occasionally attributed Goya's status as an outstanding war artist to what was assumed to be an anti-humanist streak of sadism in his temperament. No one knew better than serving personnel how helpless they were against the behemoth of war, and not surprisingly most of them focused their drawings and paintings on the

little details of daily life in which the uniqueness and personal importance of each individual was most evident. However, even more interesting evidence of the perception of war art being rooted in humanism was the existence of comparable attitudes amongst people like Harald Peake, whose furious reaction to Paul Nash's assertion that aircraft were more important than the men who flew them was noted earlier in this chapter. At the same time news reporters working abroad tended, with increasing frequency as warfare become more and more inhuman, to focus their stories ever more closely upon the daily lives of the soldiers.<sup>112</sup> The emphasis, in both art and news reporting, was on the serviceman as an individual surrounded by war, but somehow separated from it, and thus managing to retain his uniqueness in the midst of a setting that threatened to obliterate all individuality and difference. It was a desperate attempt to conceive of the War in traditional terms (i.e., as "a human event on a human scale, for all its cosmic implications and meaning"<sup>113</sup>).

Thus, beyond such factors as censorship, restrictions on sketching, infrequency of combat, and the physical and/or compositional invisibility of the War, the essentially placid character of most of the WAAC's Armed Services pictures derived from the artists' rejection of the very events that Clark and his colleagues urged them to record. Yet the WAAC should have understood (and quite possibly did understand) this. As both this chapter and much of Chapter 4 have argued,

almost every other aspect of the war art collection served to reinforce the dominance not of the War itself, but of the need for those human qualities of individuality, community and endurance, that the War constantly threatened to destroy. Paintings and drawings - even those produced by front-line combatants - were therefore rarely able to go beyond the subjects that could be portrayed within the already-existing limits of moral and emotional acceptability on the one hand, and pictorial construction on the other.

It was this conclusion that fuelled debates about whether or not war could be a source of inspiration to artists, about the relative appropriateness (as media for recording the War) of painting and photography,<sup>114</sup> and about the impossibility of producing traditional battle paintings during the Second World War. Even by the time of the Crimean War traditional battle paintings had come to be seen as inherently false in their emphasis on heroism and glory, and during the First World War battles had held a fascination for only a few of the many war artists.<sup>115</sup> In 1939-1945 Frank Wootton was one of only a small number of artists who still felt justified in producing large (41 1/2" x 59 1/2"), stagy oil paintings like his Rocket-firing Typhoons at the Falaise Gap, Normandy, 1944 (illustration 17).

Yet although the war art of 1939-1945 largely replaced traditional battle painting with something less rhetorical, its unease with approaching the war as a subject in this way

is evident in the fact that portraits of individual members of the Armed Forces - even portraits of ordinary servicemen by artists such as Kennington - continued to be invested with the aura of heroism, nobility and power that military portraiture as a genre had long enjoyed. The weighting of Services portraits in favour of decorated officers is strikingly suggestive in this regard. If battle scenes were physically and emotionally ungraspable, and if the depictions of battle by artists such as Wootton seemed outdated and false. then perhaps the only way to reinvest war painting with some of its traditional bravado and glory was to transfer those qualities to the realm of portraiture. The WAAC's Services portraits, with their emphases (on hierarchies of power) that were so out of keeping with the Committee's approach to portraits of civilians, may thus be seen as a reaction to the discovery that, during the Second World War, battle painting was no longer a viable option.

The WAAC's other reaction to the lack of battle paintings was to commission artists to produce large views of such subjects, reconstructed on the basis of news reports and information supplied by participants or eye-witnesses. Although the Committee was reluctant, during the first year of the War, to purchase or commission reconstructed views (which it seems to have equated with the worst excesses of traditional battle paintings), its opinion was modified, during 1940, by the acquisition of its first large (40" x 60") oil painting: The

Withdrawal from Dunkirk, June 1940, by Charles Cundall (illustration 18). Cundall had not witnessed the evacuation, but his painting enjoyed extraordinary popular and critical success at a time when the war art collection was growing at a rapid pace and when the WAAC was becoming increasingly concerned that it risked drowning the War in a plethora of images that captured the smaller realities, but not the epic events, of the conflict. In size, wealth of detail and coherence of statement, Cundall's painting could be seen as a key piece around which the much more numerous small and/or unwarlike works could be grouped. It was partly to acquire the funds necessary to commission more large paintings like The Withdrawal from Dunkirk that the WAAC requested an increased grant for purchases and commissions in 1940-1941 (£6500, up from £5000 in 1939-1940).<sup>14</sup>

The Committee used some of its increased budget of 1940-1941, and those of subsequent years, to commission two dozen large oil paintings of important events that were otherwise unrepresented in the war art collection. The subjects ranged from Dunkirk to D-Day, from airfights above Portland to the bombing of Berlin, and from the Altmark incident of 1940 to the sinking of the Scharnhorst in 1943. Among the artists given contracts were Walter Bayes, Charles Cundall, Barnett

---

<sup>14</sup> The two other main reasons were the rapid escalation in the numbers of potential portrait subjects (i.e., Services personnel and civilians who had been decorated for gallantry), and the geographical expansion of the War.



Freedman, and especially Richard Eurich and Charles Pears. A few uncommissioned reconstructions were also purchased, most of them from Pears.<sup>116</sup> The works were all large oil paintings, and functioned as centrepieces of the war art collection in terms of both their size and the historical importance of the subjects. Care was taken to offer commissions only to artists who could be relied upon both to invest the subjects with a suitable degree of importance, and to stop short of producing images that looked more propagandist than record-minded in intent. The artists treated epic subjects with restraint by digesting the otherwise too-large events, and reconstituting them as images in which human control (emotional as well as compositional) was clearly in evidence.

However, the members of the WAAC, as well as several of its artists and reviewers, took the view that commissioning more than a few such works would give the impression that the WAAC was retreating to a nineteenth-century approach to war art.<sup>117</sup> When in 1940 E.M.O'R. Dickey passed on to Kenneth Clark a suggestion that the Committee commission pictures showing deeds for which Victoria Crosses had been awarded, Clark's reaction was cool. "Well, let us mention it," he responded, "but it's impossible, isn't it?"<sup>118</sup> Instead of embracing the idea of relying more heavily upon visual reconstructions, the Committee continued to hope for drawings and paintings of battles that had been personally observed and recorded by artists, while it also continued to pay full-time

salaries to several artists who had already demonstrated their reluctance to address violence as a theme.

The WAAC's collection of Armed Services subjects was thus thrown out of balance by its general dearth of representations of battle, violence and horror, just as its collection of views of life on the home front was distorted by such factors as the emphasis that was placed upon the concepts of (inter alia) national unity, and shared traditions and character traits. In addition, while the Committee's interest in both the home front and the Armed Services, was rarely extended to encompass scenes of panic or violent death, its interest in the Services was further circumscribed in geographical terms. These limitations, like the others, suggested the existence of underlying attitudes to the War. In part, of course, the omission or minimisation of certain aspects of the War was beyond the WAAC's physical control to a much greater extent than were omissions in the coverage of the home front. However, some of the most interesting lacunae in the collection accorded neatly with opinions about which aspects of the War held the greatest interest vis-à-vis British government policy and public opinion.

The War in Western Europe was generally well-documented in terms of facilities, equipment and daily life, even if the battles themselves were not extensively chronicled. Official war artists made records of (inter alia) the British Expedi-

tionary Force in France in 1940 (Edward Ardizzone, Edward Bawden, Anthony Gross and R.G. Eves), the unsuccessful campaign in Norway that same year (Gross and Eric Ravillious), the Battle of Britain (Paul Nash, W.T. Monnington and Richard Eurich), the North African campaign (Ardizzone, Bawden, Gross and Henry Carr), the defence of Malta (1940-1942; Leslie Cole), the retreat from Greece (1941; Cole), the invasion of Sicily and Italy (Ardizzone, Bawden, Carr, Cole, William Coldstream and Carel Weight), the presence of Allied troops in Britain before D-Day (Henry Lamb), and the Normandy invasion and the subsequent liberation of Europe (Ardizzone, Cole, Gross, Stephen Bone, Thomas Hennell, Albert Richards and Graham Sutherland). Official war artists were sufficiently plentiful in North Africa and on the Continent that they occasionally encountered one another entirely by accident. At the end of 1944, for example, three of the War Office artists (Ardizzone, Bawden and Coldstream) were together in Rome, and Bawden and Gross had earlier travelled together in the Middle East.

However, outside of Western Europe and North Africa the coverage was more sporadic. (The Middle Eastern campaigns, for example, were recorded by only Bawden and Gross.) In some cases the neglect of non-European subjects was unintentional. British interest in the USSR, for example, was high throughout most of the War, and the paucity of pictures of events there was due more to the formidable difficulties of getting artists into the country than to any disinclination on the part of the

WAAC to make the effort.<sup>15</sup> More revealing of the Committee's interests, and of its readiness to lean with the wind of prevailing opinion, was its treatment of the Far East.

Following the loss of both Hong Kong and Singapore in 1942, British forces in the Far East were most in evidence in Burma. Anthony Gross arrived there in 1943, but the next official war artist in Southeast Asia (R.V. Pitchforth, for the Admiralty) reached Rangoon only in time to record its liberation in the spring of 1945. Also that spring Leslie Cole and Thomas Hennell (artists to the War Office and the Air Ministry, respectively) arrived in Burma, from whence they travelled to Singapore and points south. Leonard Rosoman and James Morris recorded the progress of the British Pacific Fleet, while MoI artist Bernard Hailstone was sent to paint portraits of senior officers in South East Asia Command. Rosoman worked in Australia and Hong Kong, while Morris became the only official war artist to reach Japan (though he failed to visit either Hiroshima or Nagasaki).

Yet, although the WAAC had seven artists sketching and painting in the Far East, all but Gross had been given their appointments only after the War in Europe had been concluded. (Even Gross had been sent to the area less to record the War there for its own inherent interest, than to prop up tottering

---

<sup>15</sup> Virtually all of the very few records that were produced in the USSR were the work of James Morris (a sailor in a USSR-bound convoy) and Feliks Topolski (whose presence in the Soviet Union had not been arranged by the WAAC).

British-Indian relations by producing a series of drawings showing the cooperation of the two armies on the Burma front.) Nor did the WAAC opt to issue any short-term contracts for the painting of reconstructed views of events in the Far East. The resulting visual records, restricted in geographical scope and in the number of key events that they encompassed, assumed the character of a postscript to what was, by implication, a much larger and more important war happening somewhere else.

This attitude was rooted in the broad perception of the conflict in Asia as an American affair. Even when (before Hiroshima) it was expected that the fighting in the East would continue for several months, much of British attention had been turned to the issue of post-war reconstruction. Large numbers of British servicemen and civilians were in Asia, but to a war-weary nation it all seemed very far away. In this regard the WAAC's coverage of Southeast Asia mirrored a broad base of opinion.

The WAAC's overall coverage of the Armed Services may thus, with certain reservations, be seen to form a continuum with coverage of portraiture, and with its recording of life in Britain. The Committee's drawings and paintings offered an overview that was inclined less to be interested in the compilation of a dispassionate and comprehensive history of the War, than to echo opinions about the relationship between art and war, and the need for visual documentation to focus on

what people found most compelling. The accent throughout tended to be on the human, the familiar, the comprehensible, and the assimilable. These concerns were centred on an array of attitudes and ideals that helped to unify the country's citizens, defining them and allowing them to locate themselves physically and morally within the most overwhelming historical event most of them had ever encountered.

In these ways the war art collection became an accurate guide not to the Second World War itself, but to the ways in which people experienced it, compartmentalised their reactions to it, and so learned to cope with it. In 1942 Kenneth Clark asserted that future generations, wondering what "the colour and the peculiar feeling of events in these extraordinary years" were really like, would rely for their information not upon descriptions, documentation or photographs, but upon the interpretive records in the war art collection.<sup>119</sup> Clark was writing in a context other than the analysis that has been undertaken in this chapter; but his valorisation of the subjective and the unspoken over objective documentation and official explanation was more appropriate than he may have acknowledged even to himself.

### Chapter 5: Endnotes

1. Donald Bain, "War Poet," in Brian Gardner, ed., The Terrible Rain: The War Poets 1939-1945 (London: Magnum Paperbacks Ltd, 1977, p.159).
2. For occasions on which the Committee urged contract artists to establish their own guidelines regarding the number, size and/or media of the works to be submitted in fulfilment of their contracts, see E.M.O'R. Dickey to W.D. Sturch (MoHS representative on the WAAC), 3 March 1941 (GP/55/3); and correspondence between the Committee and Graham Sutherland (GP/55/57, p.10).
3. E.M.O'R. Dickey, memorandum (19 August 1940) (GP/55/22).
4. Ian McLaine, Ministry of Morale: Home Front Morale and the Ministry of Information in World War II (London/Boston/Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1979), p.30.
5. Ibid., pp.97,99.
6. For example: George Orwell, "London Letter," Partisan Review, 8 #2 (March-April 1941), p.109. Contemporary studies of this effect are noted in McLaine, Ministry of Morale, op. cit., p.116.
7. However Jean Seaton (in "Social Revolution," in James Curran and Seaton, Power Without Responsibility: The Press and Broadcasting in Britain (Great Britain: Routledge, 1981), pp.161-171) argues that the BBC's decision to divide the Corporation into three sections (the Home Service, the Light Programme and the Third Programme), in an attempt to sustain morale, compromised its readiness to address the public as a unified whole by resurrecting old hierarchical assumptions. On lecture, interview and debate programmes, see David Cardiff, "The Serious and the Popular: Aspects of the Evolution of Style in the Radio Talk 1928-1939," in Richard Collins, James Curran et al, eds., Media, Culture and Society: A Critical Reader (London/Beverly Hills/Newbury Park/New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1986), pp.228-246.
8. On characterisation and bias in feature and documentary films during the War, see: Robert Colls and Philip Dodd, "Representing the Nation: British Documentary Film, 1930-45," Screen, 26 #1 (January-February 1985), pp.21-33; Geoffrey Hurd, ed., National Fictions: World War Two in British Film and Television (London: British Film Institute Publishing, 1984); Dilys Powell, Films Since 1939 (series: The Arts in Britain) (Great Britain: Longman's Green & Co. Ltd.,

1946/ 1947); and Jeffrey Richards, "'The Real England': National Character in Wartime Films," Encounter, 65 #1 (June 1985), pp.57-61.

9. Clive Coultass, "The Ministry of Information and Documentary Film, 1939-45," Imperial War Museum Review, #4 (1989), p.109; Jean Seaton, "Broadcasting and the Blitz," in Curran and Seaton, Power Without Responsibility, op.cit., p.156.

10. E.M.O'R. Dickey to Kenneth Clark, 2 April 1940 (GP/55/33).

11. Frank Pick (Director-General, MoI) to Kenneth Clark, 15 November 1940 (GP/46/B).

12. Minutes of the 10 April 1940, 8 November 1942 and 30 June 1943 meetings; Kenneth Clark to E.M.O'R. Dickey, February-March 1940 (GP/72/A, Part 2, p.230).

13. E.C. Gregory to Ivor Williams, July 1945 (GP/55/Wa-Wi - Ivor Williams).

14. Henry Carr to WAAC, 30 December 1940 (GP/55/124).

15. Lady Robertson to Kenneth Clark, 23 July 1941 (GP/46/B). The WAAC compiled a file on "Women's Activities" (GP/46/22), but it is very incomplete. Also of use is GP/46/19.

16. J.T.A. Burke to Mr. Leslie (MoHS), 29 May 1941 (MoHS (in PRO): HO 186/1209); Minutes of the 21 May 1941 meeting.

17. E.M.O'R. Dickey to A.R. Middleton Todd, 14 November 1941 (GP/55/190).

18. J.T.A. Burke to Mr. Leslie, op.cit., M.W. Murdoch (Public Relations Department, MoHS) to T. Craig Mitchell (Scottish Regional Office, MoHS), 30 July 1942 (MoHS (in PRO): HO 186/1209); Minutes of 21 May 1941 meeting.

19. E. Elmslie Owen to Sidney Smith, 9 March 1943 (GP/55/173). On the use of "type" portraiture in German war art projects of other countries, see Bess Hormats, "Art of the Götterdämmerung," Artnews, 74 #1 January 1975), pp.68-72.

20. For lists, see: D.V. Henderson, Dragons Can Be Defeated: A Complete Record of the George Medal's Progress from 1940 to 1983 (Great Britain: Spink & Son Ltd., 1984); and anonymous, The Register of the George Cross (Cheltenham: This England Books, 1985).



21. This fact was made much of in such articles as "Woman Fire Guard G.M. to be Painted," written by an anonymous author and published in The Sunday Pictorial on 17 April 1943.

22. Minutes of the 6 December 1939 meeting.

23. Ernest Blaikley, "[letter to the Editor]," Times (17 February 1943), p.5.

24. R.M.Y. Gleadowe (Admiralty), memorandum (20 December 1939) (Admiralty (in PRO): ADM 1/10347); Colin Coote (War Office) to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 8 March 1940 (GP/72/B(1), p.116; Minutes of the 6 March 1940 meeting.

25. On the reliance of contemporary novels upon officers rather than enlisted personnel as the central characters, see Holger Klein, "Britain," in Klein, ed., The Second World War in Fiction (London/Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1984), p.15.

26. H.E. Bates, "Introduction," in Oxford University Press, War Pictures by British Artists: R.A.F. (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942), p.7.

27. Harald Peake to Paul Nash, 10 November 1940 (Tate Archive: Paul Nash papers, 7050.47).

28. Harold Nicolson, Diaries and Letters 1939-45 (Nigel Nicolson, ed.) (London: Collins, 1967), entry for 10 June 1941.

29. A list of books written about - and often at the behest of - the Royal Air Force, is given in Robert Hewison, Under Siege: Literary Life in London 1939-45 (London/Melbourne/New York: Quartet Books, 1979), pp.38-40.

30. Alan Durst to E.C. Gregory, 20 February 1944 GP/55/370).

31. Anonymous, "The World at War - ii.: Avenging Angels," Times Literary Supplement, #2114 (8 August 1942), p.387. The Ministry of Information exploited the pretensions to symbolism of Kennington's portraits, by using them to illustrate such booklets as Front Line 1940-1941 (1941), British Women Go to War (1943) and Citizens in Wartime and After (1945).

32. E.M.O'R. Dickey to Kenneth Clark, 22 January 1941 (GP/55/1(A), p.169).

33. Minutes of the 26 November 1941 meeting.

34. Central Statistical Office, Statistical Digest of the War (series: History of the Second World War. United Kingdom Civil Series, ed. Keith Hancock), table 10, p.9.

35. Letter from Anthony Gross, intended to be read at the WAAC meeting on 11 August 1943 (GP/55/34, p.121); E.C. Gregory to Colin Coote, 13 May 1943 (ibid., p.126). In the latter instance the Committee was making specific reference to portraits of American Negroes by Basil Jonzen, and not by Gross.

36. A January 1940 provisional list of such subjects featured six principal categories (outdoor scenes, action, interiors, figure studies, women's work and night scenes), and sixteen sub-categories; see J.T.A. Burke to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 8 January 1940, in GP/72/A(2), pp.115,121).

37. This working relationship between the MoI and the CIAD was complex and, beginning in 1944, unhappy. For details, see: E.M.O'R. Dickey to Mr. Rhodes (MoI), 24 October 1939; Dickey to Kenneth Clark, 28 October 1939 (both, NG Archive: Ministry of Information Artists' Advisory Committee, 1939); Dickey to Mr. Leigh Ashton (MoI), 30 March 1940 (MoI (in PRO): INF 1/232); WAAC, "Paper No.31: Sketching Permits" (April 1940) (GP/72/C(1), p.91); Dickey to William A. Golding, 12 June 1941 (GP/55/Ga-Go - William A. Golding; Dickey to Charles Cundall, 26 August 1941 (GP/55/21); Minutes of the 14 January 1942 meeting; MoHS[?] to Patrick Keely (GP/55/K - Patrick Keely); and Dickey to Albert T. Pile, June 1942 (GP/55/Pa-Pl - Albert T. Pile). The most complete sets of correspondence relating to negotiations between the MoI and the CIAD are in MoI (in PRO): INF 1/232, and in WAAC: GP/51/4.

38. I.S. Macadam (MoI) to Kenneth Clark, 25 February 1941 (GP/55/Pa-Pl - Mrs. Phyllis Pearsall).

39. Armide Oppé (War Office) to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 15 November 1940 (GP/55/59); Minutes of the 30 July and 8 October 1941 and 9 December 1942 meetings; WAAC, "Copyright and Reproduction" (4 December 1939), p.1 (GP/72/A(1), p.30).

40. GP/55/289.

41. Edmond Kapp to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 28 December 1940 (GP/55/91). Kokoschka: John Rothenstein, Brave Day Hideous Night: Autobiography 1939-1945 (I) (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1966), pp.59,97-98. Bato: J.H. Brebner (Director, News Division, MoI) to Bato, April 1941 (WAAC, memorandum (3 June 1941) (both, GP/55/121).

42. Rowntree: correspondence dated June and July 1940 (GP/55/41). Methuen: Methuen to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 26 October 1940 (GP/55/70). Nash: Nash to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 23 April 1940

(GP/55/7, p.21; IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: John Northcote Nash (reel #1). Vaughan: William Feaver, "Wartime Romances," Sunday Times Magazine (20 May 1973), p.82; Robert Hewison, Under Siege: Literary Life in London, 1939-1945 (London/Melbourne/New York: Quartet Books, 1979), p.142.

43. Arrangements with IWM: IWM: Board of Trustees, Minutes of 22 January 1942 meeting (IWM: Central Files, #6/5). Lady Mountbatten: Evelyn Dunbar to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 2 October 1941 (GP/55/44, p.20); Minutes of the 30 July 1941 meeting. WVS: Minutes of the 18 August 1943 meeting; E.M.O'R. Dickey to R.C. Langford (MoA), 9 May 1940 (GP/55/44, p.16). BBC: GP/46/102. Directorate of Camouflage: GP/46/100. Civil Defence artists WAAC, "Paper No.17 - Artists Employed in Civil Defence" ([January 1940]) (GP/72/A(2), pp.186-187,204,205,217).

44. Stevenson, British Society 1914-45, op.cit., p.459.

45. Minutes of the 26 November 1941 meeting.

46. Minutes of the 12 February 1940 meeting.

47. WAAC, "WAAC Paper No.1: Categories of Work for War Artists" (November 1941) (GP/72/A, Part 1, p.21a); Minutes of the 19 November 1941 meeting; E.C. Gregory to S.E. Trenaman (Finance Division, MoI), 6 December 1943 (GP/72/H(1), p.38). Wellington made five detailed reports between January and July 1944 (GP/46/106).

48. Meirion and Susie Harries, The War Artists: British Official War Art of the Twentieth Century (London: Michael Joseph, in association with the Imperial War Museum and the Tate Gallery, 1983), p.266.

49. A.J.P. Taylor, English History, 1914-1945 (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1975).

50. Stephen Spender, "Introduction," in Oxford University Press, War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 2. Blitz (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942), p.7.

51. Anthony Gross, "Peintres aux armées britanniques," Arts, #82 (30 août 1946), p.3.

52. Quoted in Angus Calder, The People's War: Britain 1939-1945 (London/Toronto/Sydney/New York: Granada Publishing Limited, 1971), p.194.

53. Minutes of the 10 June 1942 meeting.

54. Spender, "Introduction," op.cit., p.7. See also J.M. Richards, ed., The Bombed Buildings of Britain: A Record of Architectural Casualties: 1940-43 (Great Britain: The Architectural Press, 1942).

55. Robert Herring, "[Editorial]," Life and Letters Today, 27 #39 (November 1940), pp.71-75. Comments on the attraction that ruined churches and cathedrals had held for artists during the First World War are given in Maria Tippet, The History of the Canadian War Memorial Scheme as a Study of Patronage and Visual Record of the Great War (Ph.D. thesis, University College London, 1982), p.187.

56. Kenneth Clark, handwritten note, 29 November 1940 (GP/55/93).

57. John Stevenson, British Society 1914-1945 (series: The Pelican Social History of Britain; J.H. Plumb, general ed.) (London: Allen Lane, 1984), pp.170-171.

58. On the War as a gendering activity, see: Joan W. Scott, "Rewriting History," Margaret R. and Patrice L.-R. Higonnet, "The Double Helix," and Denise Riley, "Some Peculiarities of Social Policy Concerning Women in Wartime and Postwar Britain" (all in M.R. Higonnet, Jane Jenson, Sonya Michel and M.C. Weitz, eds., Behind the Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1987); Maureen Honey, Creating Rosie the Riveter: Class, Gender, and Propaganda During World War II (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984); and Penny Summerfield, Women Workers in the Second World War: Production and Patriarchy in Conflict (Dover, N.H.: Croom Helm, 1984).

59. Kenneth Clark to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 16 May 1942 (GP/72/F, p.181).

60. Kenneth Clark to Brendan Bracken (Minister of Information), 15 June 1943 (GP/46/96).

61. See: Stuart Sillars, "Icons of Englishness: Tradition and Development in the Arts of the Great War," Critical Quarterly, 23 #2 (Summer 1981), pp.51-59; David Mellor, "British Art in the 1930s: Some Economic, Political and Cultural Structures," in Frank Gloversmith, ed., Class, Culture and Social Change: A New View of the 1930s (Sussex/New Jersey: The Harvester Press/Humanities Press Inc., 1980), pp.185-207; Alun Howkins' "The Discovery of Rural England," in Robert Colls and Philip Dodd, eds., Englishness: Politics and Culture 1880-1920 (London/New York/Sydney: Croom Helm, 1986), pp.62-88; Martin J. Wiener, English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850-1980 (Harmondsworth, Middlesex/United States: Penguin Books, 1985); Alex Potts' "Patriotism: The Making and

Unmaking of British National Identity," National Fictions (History Workshop Series, vol.3; Raphael Samuel, ed.) (London/New York: Routledge, 1989), pp.161-186; Graham Dawson and Bob West, "Our Finest Hour? The Popular Memory of World War II and the Struggle Over National Identity," in Geoff Hurd, ed., National Fictions, op.cit.. For Ayrton's views, see especially his four-part series of articles, "The Heritage of British Painting," in Studio, 132 #641-644 (August-November 1946), pp.33-41, 65-72, 102-110, 144-149.

62. David Mellor, A Paradise Lost: The Neo-Romantic Imagination in Britain, 1935-1955 (exhibition brochure) (London: Barbican Art Gallery, 1987), [p.2]; the wartime inter-relationships between Neo-Romantic artists and the land are explored at length in the accompanying exhibition catalogue. See also Malcolm Yorke, The Spirit of Place: Neo-Romantic Artists and Their Times (London: 1988).

63. Seaton, "Broadcasting and the Blitz," op.cit., p.148.

64. Picture Post (6 July 1940), and Vogue (July 1940); see also Ian Jeffrey and David Mellor, "Photography, 1900-1940," Studio International (July-August 1975), p.34.

65. Quoted in H.D. Willcock, Britain and Her People: A Story of a Country and Its People (London: Ward, Lock & Co., 1951), pp.140-141.

66. MoL: CEAW, "Scheme for Recording Changing Aspects of England," p.1 (NG Archive: Central Register, 1939). The same point was made in the Committee's "Second Interim Report" (August 1941), p.4 (GP/46/B), and in Eric Newton's Art for Everybody (London/ New York/Toronto: Longmans Green & Co, for the British Council, 1943) (series: Britain Advances, #7), pp.20-21.

67. Coultass, "The Ministry of Information and Documentary Film, 1939-45," op.cit., p.104.

68. An analysis of the ideological underpinnings of A Canterbury Tale is given in Nannette Aldred's "A Canterbury Tale: Powell and Pressburger's Film Fantasies of Britain," in David Mellor, ed., A Paradise Lost, op.cit., pp.117-124.

69. See, among other articles, L.B. Powell's "War-time Artists: A Neglected Sphere," Country Life, 87 (6 April 1940), p.366.

70. D.C., "Introduction," in Leicester Galleries, Imaginative Art Since the War (London: Leicester Galleries, 1942), p.5.

71. A representative list of wartime novels that explore this theme is given in Wiener, English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, op.cit., p.187, endnotes 162-163.

72. Quoted in David Mellor, "The Body and the Land," in A Paradise Lost, op.cit., p.22. Comfort's words are excerpted from his Art and Social Responsibility: Lectures on the Ideology of Romanticism (London: The Falcon Press Limited, 1946), p.25.

73. Edward Marsh to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 15 October 1940 (GP/55/10, pp.15-16). Marsh was repeating what he had been told by MacDonald.

74. Mass-Observation, [notes on art exhibitions visited by M-O representatives, 1941-1949] (Tom Harrison Mass-Observation Archive; Box Art 3).

75. Correspondence between Kenneth Clark, E.M.O'R. Dickey, and the Director-General of the MoI, 25 October 1940 (GP/46/B).

76. Minutes of the 30 July 1941 meeting.

77. E.M.O'R. Dickey to Geoffrey Cunliffe (Aluminium Controller, MAP), 24 September 1940 (GP/55/56).

78. Calder, The People's War, op.cit., pp.40-58.

79. Henry Carr to WAAC, 22 July 1940 (GP/55/124).

80. IWM Board of Trustees, Minutes of 10 October 1940 meeting (IWM: Central Files, #B6/5).

81. Walter Bayes to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 9 September 1941 (GP/55/105).

82. IWM: Board of Trustees, Minutes of the 22 January 1942 meeting (IWM: Central Files, #B6/5). See also E.C. Gregory to Thomas Gourdie, October 1944 (GP/55/393).

83. Bawden's travels are described in his letters to his wife and parents (IWM: Documents - Bawden correspondence).

84. Edward Ardizzone, quoted in Ian Stokes, "Pooter," Times (15 October 1970).

85. Minutes of the 7 February 1940 meeting; R.M.Y. Gleadowe, memorandum (9 December 1939) (Admiralty (in PRO): ADM 1/11806).

86. Barnett Freedman to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 23 April 1940 (GP/55/9). The many similar complaints by the War Office include: Edward Ardizzone, Diary of a War Artist (London/Toronto/ Sydney: The Bodley Head, 1974), p.vii; Ardizzone, Baggage to the Enemy (London: John Murray, 1941), p.2; IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: Edward Jeffrey Irving Ardizzone, RA, ARCA, FSIA (tape-recorded interview), reel #1; p. 12 of transcript; E.M.O'R. Dickey, memorandum re:Bawden's complaints, 4 June 1940 (GP/55/14(A), p.12). The original War Office policy is noted in William S. Douglas (Treasury) to Under-Secretary of State, War Office, 15 January 1940 (GP/72/ A(2), p.147), and in a memorandum written by J.H. Beith and dated 19 December 1939 (GP/72/ A(1), p.65).

87. IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: Edward Bawden, C.B.E., R.A. (tape-recorded interview), reel #4; transcript p.48.

88. Ardizzone, Diary of a War Artist, op.cit., pp.vii-viii.

89. This belief has survived to the present in the often-repeated but erroneous statement that, "often to their own annoyance, artists found themselves deployed in chauffeur-driven cars on the peripheries of the conflict" (Peter Fuller, "The Visual Arts," in The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain (Boris Ford, ed.) (Cambridge/New York/New Rochelle/Melbourne/ Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p.100). This was true almost exclusively for the War Office artists who were in France before May 1940.

90. Geoffrey Holmes, "The Nation and the Artist," Studio, 119 #567 (June 1940), p.193. See also Holmes' "Artists and War Service," Studio, 119 #566 (May 1940), p.153. The Ministry of Labour and National Service was willing to exempt artists from service in the Armed Forces if the WAAC would guarantee that they were making vital contributions to the war effort by working as artists.

91. Herbert Hodge and Eric Newton, "[The Artist in the Witness Box:] The Layman Asks Questions," Listener, 23 #581 (29 February 1940), p.429.

92. For example: Our London Art Critic, "Artists in War: The Exemption Controversy; C.R.W. Nevinson's View," Scotsman (22 March 1940), p.11.

93. For example: anonymous, "Eclipse of the Highbrow," Times (25 March 1941), p.5).

94. Kenneth Clark, "The Artist in Wartime," op.cit., p.810. Admiralty artist John Worsley later joked that he took this advice so seriously that he was promptly captured by German forces and sent to a prisoner of war camp (Martin D.W. Jones, "Into the Lion's Mouth: John Worsley, War Artist," Country Life, 179 #4618 (20 February 1986), pp.448-449).

95. Kennington expressed this view forcefully to E.M.O'R. Dickey, who recorded it in a memorandum dated 5 December 1939 (GP/55/1(A)).

96. Nevinson's 1939 remarks were quoted or summarised in several newspaper articles, including: W.P. Earp, "War Artists Should Be Soldiers. 'Can't Paint as Onlookers' Says Mr. C.R.W. Nevinson," Belfast Telegraph (26 December 1939), p.3; and anonymous, "Social and Personal," [Edinburgh] Evening Dispatch (26 December 1939), p.4. Nevinson gave another push to his anti-exemption campaign in March 1940 ("The Artist in Peace and War: His Work Vitalised By Experience [letter to the Editor]," Daily Telegraph (16 March 1940), p.6). The letter was paraphrased in several anonymous articles in other newspapers.

97. Minutes of the 30 July 1941 meeting.

98. For example: Feliks Topolski, "Contemporary Comment and Caricature," Burlington Magazine, 83 #484 (July 1943), pp.164-168; and John Rothenstein, "War and the Artist," Apollo, 37 #5 (May 1943), pp.111-113.

99. Some of the many relevant examples are cited in: IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: Colin Hayes (tape-recorded interview), reel #3; Artists in an Age of Conflict: R.C. Hall (tape-recorded interview), reel #3; and Feliks Topolski, "The Russian Front War Pictures," Art & Industry, 33 #194 (August 1942), pp.27-35.

100. Kenneth Clark, quoted in Denis Hart, "Life in a Frame, Character in a Line," Daily Telegraph Magazine (3 September 1976), p.34. According to Robert Medley, Ardizzone and Gross were "the best of the official war artists at rendering what life was actually like with an operational army. .... Something about our war made the grand statement impossible; the prevailing mood was honestly anti-heroic, humorously stoic: Ardizzone and Gross caught with perfect authenticity and sympathy this mood of brave irony" (Drawn From Life: A Memoir (London/Boston: Faber and Faber, 1983), p.194). The almost uniformly favourable critical reaction to Ardizzone's watercolours for capturing the profundity of the War is summarised in my article "'It's Not a Bad Life Sometimes': Edward Ardizzone's Drawings and Paintings of the Second World War," Imperial War Museum Review, #2 (1987), especially pp.19,21. Even the MoI, usually suspicious of the value of the



WAAC as a body and tending to be scornful of the potential of any of its art for use as propaganda or publicity, favoured Ardizzone's employment (Frank Pick (Director-General, MoI) to Kenneth Clark, 30 October 1940 (GP/55/10)).

101. Essential kits: IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: George Meddemen (tape-recorded interview), reel #3. Permits for shipboard sketching: Minutes of the 13 August, 28 August and 10 September 1941 meetings.

102. Colin Coote to E.C. Gregory, 20 July 1943 (GP/55/239).

103. Away from the battlefield, Alexander Macpherson was approached by the Committee to do a picture of Norwegian refugees arriving in the Orkney Islands, but the theme was subsequently ruled to be too sensitive to be recorded in art; see E.M.O'R. Dickey to Alexander Macpherson, 11 June 1942; Armide Oppé (Admiralty) to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 26 June 1942 (both, GP/55/112). Two years earlier, in September 1940, the Admiralty Press Division had declined to extend facilities to Graham Sutherland and John Armstrong to paint burning oil tanks at Swansea (Minutes of the 12 September 1940 meeting).

104. MoI: Home Morale Emergency Committee, "First Interim Report" (22 May 1940) (in PRO: INF 1/254); Hansard, 351 (3 October 1939), columns 1860-1861; Hansard, 360 (24 April 1940), column 186.

105. George P. Thomson, Blue Pencil Admiral: The Inside Story of Press Censorship (London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co., Ltd., 1947), p.12; MoI (in PRO): INF 1/529; Philip Knightley, The First Casualty: The War Correspondent as Hero, Propagandist, and Myth Maker from the Crimea to Vietnam (London: Andre Deutsch, 1975), pp.223-224; and Joseph J. Mathews, Reporting the Wars (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1957), pp.188-190.

106. John Lehmann, "Foreword," Penguin New Writing, #4 (March 1941), p.7.

107. Helpful remarks on this phenomenon are made in Alison H. Scott, English Poetry of the Second World War (M.Litt. thesis, Aberdeen University, 1968); see especially pp.11,18,34, 38-41,99,277-278.

108. For example John Nash, working for the Admiralty in 1940, complained, "This war is the wrong kind of war, it does not come to us very much yet and we can't seem to get at it" (Nash to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 23 August 1940 (GP/55/7)).

109. IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: Edward Jeffrey Irving Ardizzone, RA, ARCA, FSIA (tape-recorded interview); Ardizzone, Diary of a War Artist, op.cit., p.36, entry for 17 September 1943.

110. Edward Bawden to Charlotte Bawden, 29 August 1940 (IWM: Department of Documents - Bawden correspondence).

111. Perspex, "Art Notes: The Stimulus of War," Apollo, 37 (1943), pp.44-45,55. See also: anonymous, "The War: As Artists See It; Monstrous Machines - Men Like Ants," Evening News (2 July 1940), p.5; anonymous, "The Artist and the War: Victory as a Theme," Times (8 February 1943), p.2; E.H. Ramsden, "A Critical Survey of the Work of the Younger Exhibitors," in Alex Comfort and John Bayliss, eds., New Road 1943: New Directions in European Art and Letters (Essex: The Grey Walls Press, 1943); John Rothenstein, "War and the Artist," op.cit., 37 #5 (May 1943), pp.111-113; and AIA [correspondence and notes for the 1943 lecture series The Artist and the War] (Tate: AIA: 7043.2).

112. Mathews, Reporting the Wars, op.cit., pp.193-194). Similar observations are made in Paul Fussell, Wartime: Understanding and Behavior in the Second World War (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), chapter 18.

113. Siegmur Holsten, Allegorische Darstellungen des Krieges 1870-1918 (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1976); summarised in Donald B. Kuspit, "Uncivil War," Artforum, 21 #8 (April 1983), pp.37-38.

114. These phenomena, as they relate to the art of the First World War, are explored in Jon Bird's article "Representing the Great War," Block, #3 (1980), pp.41-52. A comparable analysis of First World War poetry and literature is Paul Fussell's The Great War and Modern Memory (London: Oxford University Press, 1977). Some of the implications of war art as a "means of forgetfulness" intended to maintain "a position of cultural hypocrisy" are considered by Kuspit in "Uncivil War," op.cit., pp.34-43.

115. Matthew Paul Lalumia, Realism and Politics in Victorian Art of the Crimean War (series: Studies in the Fine Arts: Iconography, #9; series editor, Linda Seidel) (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1984); Susan Malvern, Art, Propaganda and Patronage. An History of the Employment of British Artists 1916-1919 (Ph.D. thesis, University of Reading, 1981), p.205; Maria Tippet, Art at the Service of War, op.cit., pp.22,69. According to the Minutes of the 27 March 1940 meeting of the WAAC, there was general agreement that, "while such artists as Mr. Paul Nash might create imaginative renderings of these subjects [such as the Battle of the River

Plate], factual reconstructions were as a rule unsatisfactory...."

116. Eurich's methods of painting reconstructions are discussed in Harries and Harries, The War Artists, op.cit., pp.218-219.

117. IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: Anthony Gross (tape-recorded interview), reel #2. See also Mathews, Reporting the Wars, op.cit., p.18.

118. Kenneth Clark to E.M.O'R. Dickey, 6 November 1940 (GP/55/21). No such pictures were ever bought or commissioned by the WAAC.

119. [Kenneth Clark], introductory note, in Oxford University Press, War Pictures by British Artists (four volumes: War at Sea; Blitz; R.A.F.; and Army) (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942).

Chapter 61945-1947

"How did I fill in my days [during the War]? Chiefly by sitting on committees. The Mint Committee, the Post Office Advisory Committee, C.E.M.A., The National Art-Collections Fund, the Council of Industrial Design ..., the National Gallery Concerts, and, my only worthwhile activity, the War Artists Committee."

-Kenneth Clark<sup>1</sup>

With the end of hostilities in Europe and later in Asia, the War Artists' Advisory Committee entered the final phase of its existence. This chapter examines the WAAC's final days, as well as the process (undertaken after the dissolution of the Committee) of distributing the war art collection amongst a variety of institutions at home and abroad.

1945 and the Burlington House Exhibition

At the end of February 1945, E.C. Gregory submitted a memorandum outlining subjects still to be recorded on the WAAC's behalf. These included the signing of the Armistice, triumphal marches, the disposal of the German fleet, and fighting in the Far East, along with many portraits of civilian and Armed Services celebrities.<sup>2</sup> The WAAC also proposed to take advantage of the return of Services personnel to Britain by paying ten artists amongst them £200 apiece to undertake commissions to create works showing important actions in which

they had been involved.<sup>3</sup>

Ministry reaction, however, was cool. Although receptive to providing funds to acquire pictures of the German surrender and the ensuing victory celebrations, officials were critical of plans to record activities in occupied territories, or to hire soldiers, airmen and sailors to paint retrospective representations of military actions. It was generally conceded, however, that it would be inappropriate for the Ministry to stop funding the Committee entirely when certain events of great historical interest were expected to occur in the near future. A compromise was therefore reached between the MoI and the WAAC whereby the latter was funded for five months (1 April-31 August 1945) beyond the expiration of its most recent grant, and later for the four months from 1 September until 31 December. The two grants were for £4500 and £3600 respectively, calculated from the basic yearly rate of £10,750 that had been used to establish the level of the funding given to the Committee for the period 1 September 1944-1 April 1945.

Aside from adding more items to its collection during the last half of 1945, the WAAC was also involved in the preparation of its swan song: a mammoth retrospective display of approximately 20% of its acquisitions, to be held before the collection as a whole was permanently broken up. To facilitate the preparation of such a display, the Committee began calling loans and touring exhibitions back to London, and sent out as few new ones as possible.

In scale, the final exhibition was comparable to the displays of Canadian and British First World War art that had been organised in 1919 and in 1919-1920, respectively. As had been the case with these earlier exhibitions, the one in 1945 was held at Burlington House, the National Gallery no longer being available because its collection had been retrieved and reinstalled shortly after the German surrender. On 13 October, two months after the Japanese capitulation, the largest display of war art to be seen in Britain in three decades - 1028 drawings, paintings and prints, and 21 sculptures - was opened to the public. Later in the month fifty new pictures (some received or purchased only after the show had first been hung) were added, and in November another forty-two new items were installed. The exhibition closed on 25 November, after having remained open for six weeks.

The WAAC attempted to include in the exhibition representations of every significant aspect of the War that had been recorded under its auspices. To this end the Armed Services representatives, though not on the hanging committee, were asked to submit lists of works that they would like to see included. However, the hanging committee itself (Clark, Muirhead Bone and Randolph Schwabe) felt free to omit pictures and sculptures that it deemed to be of insufficient artistic interest. This was in keeping with their longstanding emphasis on the importance of aesthetic quality as a criterion in the selection of individual pieces of war art. Thus, although all

of the 37 official war artists had work included in the show (to which they contributed 71.6% of the exhibits), the same was true for only 62 of the 101 artists who had been awarded short-term contracts (19.7% of the exhibits), and only 52 of the 267 artists who had sold or donated work to the WAAC (8.7% of the exhibits).<sup>1</sup> Nor does there seem to have been any attempt to give parity to the included artists. For example, the admiration in which the Committee as a whole (and Clark in particular) held Henry Moore was reflected in the inclusion of 63% of his drawings - a substantially higher percentage than was enjoyed by most other artists.

By the beginning of November 1945, however, the members of the WAAC had concluded that too few people were visiting Burlington House, and that more extensive advertising was needed.<sup>4</sup> By the time the six-week exhibition ended a profit of £543.6.5 had been made, but the total number of people who had paid the entry fee (i.e., 19,462) was thought disappointing.<sup>5</sup> In comparison, some 16,615 people had seen the six-week WAAC exhibition that had been held in Leicester in 1942 under the auspices of the British Institute of Adult Education. That same year 12,000 people had visited another of the travelling exhibitions, in Braintree, in only two weeks; and in 1941 11,500 had seen a four-week showing of war art in Colchester.

Probably the greatest hindrance to better attendance was

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix 5.

the fact that, after the War had ended in Europe (May) and Asia (August), public interest in everything associated with it had dwindled. An additional factor was public familiarity with the war art collection. (After the First World War the display of Canadian art at Burlington House had excited much public interest, including that of the young Kenneth Clark, but this was principally because the works had not been readily or widely available for viewing during the War itself.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, the large 1919-1920 display of British war art had consisted in large part of unfamiliar works.<sup>7</sup> It had lasted two months, had been seen by 38,000 people, and had earned a profit of £1000.) In any case the WAAC's disappointment at the 1945 attendance levels had not been unanticipated. Clark's preface to the exhibition catalogue included a frank assessment of the likely post-war popularity of the art that had been bought and commissioned by the Committee:

It is possible that at no time will these pictures seem less interesting than they do at present. Their subjects belong to a past which we would gladly forget, but which is not yet remote enough to have become curious, and, as works of art, they are associated in our minds with five years of boredom and privation.<sup>8</sup>

A few reviewers agreed that, for a population at peace for the first time in six years, the art did lack interest. "The war was a ghastly boredom and these pictures very faithfully record ghastliness and boredom on a global scale," wrote the



critic for The Scotsman. "In fifty years time it may perhaps be exciting to have these records before one, but it is not possible to be just and critical, far less excited, at present."<sup>9</sup> The reviewer for New Statesman and Nation agreed: "I don't find sixteen rooms of War pictures more enjoyable than three. (Does anyone?)"<sup>10</sup>

Yet despite the country's readiness to turn its back on the events of the preceding six years, such unenthusiastic reactions were in the minority amongst the many writers in newspapers, general magazines and specialist journals who turned their attention to the show in October and November 1945. Most were of the opinion that sixteen rooms of war art were very much better indeed than three, and that the collection should be kept together long enough to be sent on prolonged tours throughout the country and around the world.<sup>11</sup> As they had done since July 1940, critics praised the works for two principal reasons: because many of the paintings, drawings, prints and sculptures functioned as fine documentary records of recent events, and because several others went beyond the demands of strict recording to explore subjective impressions and reactions. The first of these two rationales was held by writers in publications as different from one another as The Evening Standard and Country Life.<sup>12</sup> The view that the exhibition owed its success to the emotional evocativeness of certain works was expressed most forcefully by those, like Maurice Collis,<sup>13</sup> whose sympathies had long been

with the more experimental contemporary artists. Like the wartime exhibitions that were seen at the National Gallery and in the provinces, the 1945 show offered something for almost every taste - a element of some importance in accounting for the favourable notices that it received in the press. For every Eric Newton praising the appropriateness of modernism in war art<sup>14</sup> there was at least one F.C. Tilney to champion the work of Norman Wilkinson, Charles Cundall, Charles Pears and Frederick Elwell.<sup>15</sup> Even Michael Ayrton, who dismissed 50% of the show as competent journalism and 40% as junk, conceded that 10% of the exhibits repaid close examination.<sup>16</sup>

However, the favourable reviews did not reassure Clark that the much-heralded "renaissance of taste" would endure beyond the return of social life to pre-war conditions after the years of stress and privation. "The English," he was later to write in one volume of his autobiography, "are a philistine people,"<sup>17</sup> and his letters and memoranda dating from 1945 express comparable sentiments. He therefore believed that the public must be constantly reminded of its often newfound interest in art, and that the war art collection itself must not be allowed to slide into obscurity. This being so, the mechanics of its dispersal assumed substantial importance.

#### 1946-1947: Dispersal of the WAAC Collection

The War Artists' Advisory Committee was dissolved on 31

December, five weeks after the close of the Burlington House exhibition. A few months earlier its members had anticipated that the Committee's responsibilities would extend beyond its own dissolution, and had made preparations to transfer its operation to a joint Imperial War Museum-Ministry of Information subcommittee.<sup>18</sup> The latter held its first meeting on 30 January 1946, with Muirhead Bone (in his roles as a former member of the WAAC and as a Trustee of the IWM) in the chair.<sup>2</sup> Four meetings were held before the subcommittee was dissolved, at the end of March.<sup>19</sup> Its members were funded by a £3000 grant received on the Ministry of Information's Vote to cover the period 1 January-31 March.

Part of the subcommittee's mandate involved the supervision of the few official war artists who were still at work, and the commissioning and purchasing (even as late as the first half of 1946) of other works to fill in some of the many gaps in the WAAC's history of the War. (£1250 of the £3000 grant was intended to cover the costs of new commissions and purchases.) The members spent much of the rest of their time between 30 January and 31 March tracing missing or overdue pictures and sculptures, eventually acquiring hitherto out-

---

<sup>2</sup> Others associated with the WAAC who now sat on the subcommittee were Randolph Schwabe, E.M.O'R. Dickey, E.C. Gregory, Oliver Warner (Admiralty), Selwyn Jepson (War Office), A. Blackborow (Air Ministry) and Irene Neville Oxford-Coxall (who had worked for the WAAC since 1939, first as its Clerk/Typist and later as Research Assistant). The Museum was represented by two more of its Trustees (Lady Norman and Sir Frederic Kenyon), its Director (L.R. Bradley) and its Keeper of Art (Ernest Blaikley).

standing pictures from fifteen artists. Unfulfilled contracts issued earlier in the War to eight other artists were cancelled.<sup>20</sup> On 31 March the MoI itself was disbanded, and its financial commitment to the subcommittee therefore came to an end. As of 1 April all outstanding contracts were cancelled except for three, belonging to Muirhead Bone, Barnett Freedman and Jacob Epstein, all of whom had been delayed "through 'force majeure'" and for each of whom the Treasury agreed to process payment when their contracts were eventually fulfilled.<sup>21</sup>

However, more important (and certainly more onerous) than the task of adding yet more works of war art to the already large number accumulated by the WAAC was the job of arranging for the dispersal of the now homeless collection (temporarily housed at the IWM) to interested organisations. On 6 May 1946 IWM Trustees Muirhead Bone, Sir Frederic Kenyon and Lady Norman were invited by the Museum to form an allocations committee "to deal with all matters relating to the WAAC."<sup>22</sup>

The distribution of its art collection had actually been one of the duties assigned to the WAAC in its 1939 terms of reference. Throughout the War, however, the members had persistently refused to establish a firm policy on the matter, preferring always to await the end of hostilities. Over the course of the War a very few works had in fact been given to foreign governments and institutions as diplomatic gifts, but always at the insistence of officials exasperated by what

appeared to be the WAAC's lack of interest in an apparently obvious technique for promoting good will between Britain and her allies. "An enormous collection of paintings has been created at the public expense, few of which can be of any permanent value," had written the MoI's Deputy Director-General to Brendan Bracken in October 1944. "...Any disposal of a few of them which has a benevolent purpose, such as the important one of Anglo-French relations, seems to me well justified."<sup>23</sup>

In October 1945 the WAAC could wait no longer to formalise plans to break up its cache of war art. In that month it placed an announcement in newspapers and magazines throughout Britain, alerting institutions wishing to be given custody of war art that they should submit lists of the items they wanted.<sup>24</sup> Reference copies of the Burlington House catalogue were made available for this purpose. A similar announcement was circulated to the Service Departments, the Museums Association, the High Commissioners for the Dominions, and other foreign governments that had an interest in subjects or personalities represented in specific works in the collection. Applicants were not allowed to represent private interests, and were required to have permanent buildings that were both suitable for housing art and reasonably accessible to the public. According to the Burlington House catalogue,

...It is evident that the National Maritime Museum at Greenwich will have first pick of all work of naval interest, and

the Imperial War Museum will claim a large share of those pictures whose interest is primarily historical; whereas those which are most valuable as works of art will be available for the Tate Gallery. In the provinces and the Empire there will be galleries ready to accept pictures of local interest, and there will be many justifiable demands from the Services. Although it is no doubt desirable to keep together one comprehensive collection, the whole output of these six years is sufficiently large to admit of wide disposal.<sup>25</sup>

The process of distributing the almost 6000 works of art amongst the approximately sixty organisations and institutions that submitted successful applications was, predictably, immensely complicated. For example, many works were claimed by two or more applicants, and many others were claimed by no one at all.<sup>26</sup> In addition, early in the War the WAAC had tentatively expected to distribute most of the items to the national museums. However, as the collection grew, and as travelling exhibitions revealed the strong interest in art in provincial centres, the number of likely recipients increased.

The latter development must have pleased Clark. As has been argued in previous chapters, he recognised that the War offered him an ideal opportunity to familiarise a rapidly-growing audience with contemporary British art. His appointment as chairman of the allocations committee was significant in this respect. The committee was an IWM body. It had no formal affiliation with the Ministry of Information, and Clark was neither an employee nor a Trustee of the Museum. However,

he had a sufficiently strong interest in spreading awareness of good contemporary art that in the mid-1940's he donated one hundred of his own pictures to the Contemporary Art Society, for distribution to provincial museums,<sup>27</sup> and he later made a gift of several pictures by Victor Pasmore ("in my opinion, one of the two or three most talented English painters of this century") to public galleries, because "I wanted his work to be known."<sup>28</sup>

If Clark used his influence on the IWM committee in a comparable way, to encourage local interest in what he considered particularly good art, then there ought to be supporting evidence in the allocations themselves.<sup>29</sup> Intriguingly, there does seem to be support for speculation of this type, although extant correspondence between the committee and the recipient institutions is too fragmentary to facilitate either a detailed analysis of, or firm conclusions about, the exact nature and extent of the committee's intentions. What is known is that many provincial and foreign institutions based their acquisitions requests only on the entries given in the 1945 Burlington House catalogue. (Comprehensive lists of artworks acquired by the WAAC did exist, but do not seem to have been sent to potential recipient institutions as a matter of course.) Only 37% of the artists who contributed to the war art collection were listed in the catalogue. Fully 40% of the artists who worked on short-term contracts were omitted, along with 81% of the artists who sold or donated work to the WAAC.

In addition, the final decision as to which works were included in the exhibition had been made by a three-man hanging committee that included not only the new chairman of the allocations committee (Clark), but also one of its senior members (Muirhead Bone). These facts suggest that the committee was not overly concerned to ensure that the entire collection should be subject to dispersal beyond the Imperial War Museum, which ultimately became the repository of the war art produced by most of the artists who were patronised by the WAAC.

It should also be noted that the allocations committee encouraged institutions to accept artworks that had not been included on the submitted lists of requests, and that the artists specifically mentioned in this context, in the surviving documentation, are all artists that had been strongly favoured by the WAAC. This approach was not restricted to galleries and museums (such as the Southampton Art Gallery) which submitted only general outlines of the types of work in which they were interested, expecting the committee to make an appropriate selection on their behalf. The British Council, for example, applied for some forty clearly-specified works, but was also offered several extra drawings by Edward Bawden (which it accepted) and a watercolour by Paul Nash (which it did not).<sup>30</sup> In another instance Clark decided to encourage art galleries and museums to accept pictures by Carel Weight,<sup>31</sup> and comparable correspondence exists regarding work by other artists.



It is with these points in mind that a study of the ultimate destinations of the war pictures by Paul Nash, Graham Sutherland, Henry Moore and John Piper is instructive. These were four artists who were particularly admired and promoted by the WAAC in general, and by Clark in particular. Sutherland and Piper had produced work to which certain provincial galleries had a claim for geographical reasons. Sutherland had recorded bomb damage and tin mining scenes in Wales, and Piper had chronicled bomb damage in Bath and Bristol. Otherwise the rest of their art, along with that of Moore and Nash, might have been expected to be split, for the most part, between the Tate Gallery (which in 1941 had officially informed the WAAC that it had a particular interest in acquiring war pictures by Sutherland, Moore and Piper<sup>32</sup>), the Air Ministry (which had employed Nash as an official war artist in 1940), the Imperial War Museum, and the British Council. (The latter was tentatively ranked second, after the Tate Gallery, as a recipient of items that were considered more important as works of art than as historical records.)

Yet of the forty-four pictures by Nash that survived the War, only four went to each of the IWM and the Air Ministry, and three to the Tate. The remaining thirty-three were divided between twelve British art galleries and museums (none of them located in London), and seven institutions abroad.<sup>3</sup> Interest in Nash's art was sufficiently high to guarantee that none of

---

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix 6.

his watercolours or oil paintings were unclaimed. Nonetheless, as noted above, the allocations committee made an effort to persuade the British Council to accept one of the watercolours. In addition, the donation of seven of Nash's works to institutions in other countries was not in accord with the procedure outlined in the Burlington House catalogue for making such gifts (i.e., on the basis of local interest. One of every four pictures by Henry Lamb, for example, became the property of the National Gallery of Canada because of the time that Lamb had spent making portraits and subject pictures of Canadian soldiers in Britain.) If one of the aims of the allocations committee was to publicise the best of contemporary British art, it did not limit its sights to institutions within Britain.

Similarly, of the ninety-six Graham Sutherland pictures that survived the War, six were given to the Imperial War Museum, nine to the Tate Gallery, four to the British Council, and nineteen (showing Welsh subjects) to the National Museum of Wales. The remaining fifty-eight were divided amongst twenty-six collections in Britain and three more abroad. Forty-two of John Piper's works survived the War, but only one-third were awarded to Bristol (four), the Tate Gallery (three), the Imperial War Museum (six) and the British Council (one). (None, strangely, went to Bath.) The other twenty-eight were sent to sixteen collections at home and abroad. As for the twenty-seven Henry Moore drawings of London Underground

shelters and of mining in Yorkshire, the Tate Gallery took eight, the IWM three and the British Council two. The London Museum, despite its mandate to document the history of the capital, received only one, perhaps because Moore's war art was available for viewing elsewhere in London. This left almost exactly half of his twenty-seven works to be distributed amongst eight British museums and galleries.

Statistics similar to those for Nash, Sutherland, Piper and Moore could be given for other artists who were particularly favoured by the WAAC (Henry Lamb, R.V. Pitchforth and Eric Ravilious, for example). In part the regional demands (for the work of certain well-publicised artists) that prompted this breadth of distribution reflected the contribution of the WAAC's wartime exhibitions to the building of interest in contemporary British art. Yet it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that the distribution was somewhat biased. On the one hand the allocations committee did more than accede (as would be expected) to the geographically widespread assignment of certain artists' work; in several cases the members actually promoted it (as with the British Council regarding a Nash watercolour, which the committee probably hoped that the Council would use in its exhibitions abroad). At the same time, however, the allocations committee made no noteworthy efforts to draw the work of many other artists to the attention of potential recipient museums and galleries, and many such works were therefore consigned to the

Imperial War Museum by default. (Whereas works by 81% of the artists who were given short-term contracts by the WAAC are deposited in institutions other than the IWM, the same is true for only half of the artists who sold or donated work to the Committee. In this regard it is worth recalling that both the chairman and a senior member of the IWM committee - Clark and Bone - had also exercised substantial influence in the determination of which artists were worthy of being awarded WAAC contracts.)

Unfortunately, the loss or destruction since the War of much of the relevant correspondence hinders the formulation of a comprehensive evaluation of the factors that influenced the allocation committee's actions. The proposal made in the preceding pages must therefore remain tentative. Certainly the factors accounting for the extent of allocation were various. Nonetheless, to attribute the overall character of the allocations to an uncomplicated equation between supply and demand seems, on the basis of the evidence proposed above, to be an approach that leaves itself open to certain objections.

What is known with certainty is that more than three-quarters of the art collection was given to institutions and government departments (including the Armed Services) in London, and that the overwhelming majority of these works were not included in the exhibition at Burlington House. More than 70% of these (or rather more than half of all pieces of war art) went (often by forfeit) to the Imperial War Museum,<sup>33</sup>

which had agreed in 1939 not to acquire contemporary war art without first offering it to the WAAC. The only recipients (aside from the IWM) of more than 100 items were the Ministry of Works (169), the Air Ministry (343) and the National Maritime Museum (399). The Tate Gallery took only 75. A total of 1811 pieces (representing one of every three pounds spent in building the collection<sup>34</sup>) were awarded to non-exchequer bodies, including provincial galleries and museums, and foreign museums and governments.<sup>4</sup> Some 14% of these works showed the citizens and wartime activities of Australia and Tasmania, New Zealand, Canada, South Africa, Malta and the Sudan, and many of these works were given to museums and art galleries in those countries.

### Conclusion

On 4 March 1947, almost two years after VE Day, Treasury authorisation was finally given to present the pictures and sculptures to the non-exchequer recipients. By the end of that year most of the works had been dispatched to their final homes from storage in the Imperial War Museum. At that time it was estimated that the entire war art project had cost the Treasury £96,000.<sup>35</sup> It had given full-time employment as official war artists to thirty-six men and one woman, had given short-term contracts to 101 other painters, draughtspersons,

---

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix 6.

printmakers and sculptors, and had acquired pictures or sculptures submitted by 267 more amateur and professional artists.

The WAAC's work was inextricably associated with the War, and suffered the same loss of public interest, in the weeks and months after the late summer of 1945, as was suffered by literature that took the War as its theme.<sup>36</sup> In this regard, the wide range of the dispersal of the war art collection to museums and galleries acted as a guarantee of sorts that at least some items in the collection would be seen not as records of an event that, in the short term, people wished to forget. They might instead be expected to be approached as examples of fine art, existing independently of the conflict that had generated them.

Yet even if this had failed to happen, that failure would not have minimised the importance of the WAAC in the history of the visual arts in Britain. Clark himself, reviewing his many wartime activities, later described his membership on the Committee as "my only worthwhile activity."<sup>37</sup> For the artists, their dealings with the WAAC were frequently invaluable in furthering their abilities and careers. The combination of patronage and access to stimulating subjects had led artists such as Graham Sutherland and John Piper to do some of their finest work to date. Rosemary Allan was only one of several who later stated that the challenge of executing set subjects under difficult conditions had been very useful for their development.<sup>38</sup> Henry Moore traced the post-war recentering of

his art on the human subject to the impact made upon him by the shelterers: "It humanised everything I had been doing. I knew at the time that what I was sketching represented an artistic turning point for me...."<sup>39</sup> For young painters like John Worsley and Bernard Hailstone the War marked the beginnings of their professional careers, and the British government (represented by the War Artists' Advisory Committee) was their first important patron. By comparison, only a few artists considered their work for the WAAC to have been of minimal importance for their development. In addition, the Committee "discovered" Albert Richards. An art student who had completed only one term at the Royal College of Art when he was conscripted into the Royal Engineers, Richards would probably have remained almost entirely unknown beyond a local level had not the Committee given him encouragement and opportunity to paint (as an official war artist) before his early death in 1945.

The WAAC also encouraged artists who had been partial to life in the much-maligned ivory tower, to rethink the thorny issue of their responsibility to society. As early as 1943 John Rothenstein summarised prevailing opinion on this point:

British artists have been strongly affected by the spectacle of the present war and official patronage has given them every occasion to express their feelings and has even pointed the way to themes which have evoked in them an earnest response. As a result many artists who might have seemed, before the war, to have cultivated an esoteric vision, have found, in

their reactions to the war a common ground of contact with the public, thus narrowing the lamentable rift which had tended in the years between the wars to place the artist, increasingly immersed in theory or the curiosity of his personality, in a position of unprecedented isolation.<sup>40</sup>

In the long term Rothenstein's comments were to prove overly optimistic. Yet they contained an important kernel of truth that was as applicable to the attitudes of the general public as it was to those of artists. The weakening of the pronounced pre-1939 division between art opportunities and productivity in London and the rest of the country encouraged the development of new audiences for, and participants in, the post-war art world. The WAAC was thus one catalyst of the broader trend, towards a more equitable distribution of opportunities in society, that culminated in the Beveridge Report. Commercial galleries mounting their first post-war exhibitions included in their selections many more works by contemporary British artists than they had in their August 1939 shows. When in 1946 the Dartington Hall Trustees noted that "the visual arts are integral to a civilisation,"<sup>41</sup> they did so with more general support than would have been the case only seven years earlier.

Nor was an impact made only on public perceptions of art. The WAAC also demonstrated to the government that art and the state could operate within a mutually beneficial relationship. The Committee had been pleased that it had been able to give support to artists during a difficult time in their careers,



and to strengthen interest in their work. The government had benefited from the discovery that the fine arts, as distinguished from blatant propaganda, could be good for public relations, and could even act as an understated form of pro-British propaganda. These were lessons that the post-war government took to heart. In April 1945, for example, a Labour policy paper emphasised the need "to assure to our people full access to the great heritage of culture in this nation."<sup>42</sup> Public and press reaction to the war art exhibitions, with their subtle assertion of Britain's idealised wartime view of herself, had proved that "official" art need not be unpopular art. This, and the readiness of the Committee to embrace a wide range of art styles (thus avoiding the charge that state support implied the imposition of an "official" style), were factors for the government to consider when, in 1945, it created the Arts Council as a permanent organ of state patronage. The WAAC's avoidance of blatant propaganda thus ensured that the impact of the war art was at least as much long-term as short-term. The Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts is the organisation usually cited as the principal forerunner of the Arts Council, but one could argue that the WAAC's example was also crucial. In the final analysis the War Artists' Advisory Committee was about much more than war art as a genre. Recognition of its importance for British post-war cultural life and politics is long overdue.

## Chapter 6: Endnotes

1. Kenneth Clark, The Other Half: A Self-Portrait (London: John Murray, 1977), p.55.
2. E.C. Gregory, "Memorandum of Work Still To Be Done by War Artists' Advisory Committee" (21 February 1945) (GP/72/H(2), p.77). Additional lists of portrait subjects are given in GP/72/H(2), pp.158ff.
3. E.C. Gregory, "Memorandum Prepared as a Basis for Discussion of the Future of the War Artists' Advisory Committee" (22 May 1945) (GP/72/H(2), p.145).
4. Minutes of the 7 December 1945 meeting.
5. Royal Academy, Minutes of the 11 December 1945 and 20 June 1946 meetings (Minute Book, in RA Archive).
6. Maria Tippett, Art at the Service of War: Canada, Art and the Great War (Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 1984), pp.76-81.
7. Susan Malvern, Art, Propaganda and Patronage. An History of the Employment of British Artists 1916-1919 (Ph.D. thesis, University of Reading, 1981), p.419.
8. [Kenneth Clark], "Preface," in Exhibition of National War Pictures (And a Few Pieces of Sculpture) (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1945), p.4.
9. Anonymous, "War Pictures: Vast Collection at the Royal Academy; An Amazing Show," Scotsman (13 October 1945), p.7.
10. Roger Marvell, "War Artists and Sculptors," New Statesman and Nation, 30 #765 (20 October 1945), p.260.
11. For example: anonymous, "War Pictures: Royal Academy Exhibition," British Weekly, 119 #3077 (18 October 1945), p.42; and Hannen Swaffer, "Soul of a People Shown in Art," Daily Herald (15 October 1945), p.2.
12. Horace Thorogood, "They Show War Had Beauty as Well as Horror," Evening Standard ([October 1945; clipping in 1945 newspaper reviews file in IWM: Art]); John Rothenstein, "Reflections on the National War Pictures Exhibition," Country Life 98 (2 November 1945), pp.776-777.
13. Maurice Collis, "Art," Observer (21 October 1945), p.2.

14. Eric Newton, "War Art in Retrospect," Sunday Times (14 October 1945), p.2.

15. [F.C. Tilney], "War Pictures at the R.A.," Art and Reason, 11 #132 (December 1945), pp.1-2.

16. Michael Ayrton, "Art," Spectator (November 1945), p.408.

17. Kenneth Clark, The Other Half, op.cit., p.123.

18. Minutes of the 4 July 1945 meeting.

19. 30 January, 27 February, 13 March and 25 March. The Minutes from the first three are held in GP/46/116. Those from the 25 March meeting have been lost. For a convenient summary of the Imperial War Museum's involvement with the war art collection at this time, see its War History of the Imperial War Museum (London: [HMSO?], n.d.).

20. The artists submitting overdue pictures were Leonard Appelbee, Henry Carr, T.C. Dugdale, Evelyn Dunbar, Hubert Freeth, Charles Ginner, Frances Macdonald, W.P. Moss, Rodrigo Moynihan, P.E. Phillips, Kenneth Rowntree, Peter Scott, Alan Sorrell, John Worsley and (after the end of March and only after threats of legal action) Wyndham Lewis. Contracts with Francis Dodd, Percy Metcalfe, Donald Moodie, Rodrigo Moynihan, Ceri Richards, Randolph Schwabe, A.R. Middleton Todd and John Wheatley, were cancelled.

21. IWM: Art Subcommittee, Minutes of the 13 March 1946 meeting (GP/46/116).

22. IWM: Standing Committee and Board of Trustees, Minutes of the 6 May 1946 meeting (IWM: Central File #B6/1).

23. Deputy Director-General, MoI to Brendan Bracken, 11 October 1944 (GP/46/123). This was in connection with the presentation, in 1944, of four pictures from Anthony Gross' Liberation of France series to the French Ambassador. In 1941 Anthony Eden had given a drawing by Dennis Flanders to a Minister in the Columbian Government, and an Eric Kennington portrait had been donated to a diplomat returning from London to America, apparently in the hope that it would be used for propaganda there. In 1944 Brendan Bracken had persuaded the WAAC to give two pictures, by Kenneth Green and Robert Austin, to the Broken Hill Museum in Australia in recognition of the town's outstanding per capita war effort (GP/46/119).

24. The texts of the letter to institutions abroad, as well as the press announcement in Britain (both, October 1945), are included in GP/46/110).

25. [Clark], "Preface," in Exhibition of National War Pictures (And a Few Pieces of Sculpture), op.cit., p.4.

26. The relevant files, held by the Department of Art of the IWM, seem to be incomplete. For samples of the disputes that arose, see: IWM, Central Files, #B6/2: L.R. Bradley (IWM) to Muirhead Bone (22 January 1947) re: why the Air Ministry was dissatisfied with the works allocated to it; and Tate Archive File #34 - War Artists Advisory Committee. Correspondence and Lists of Works by War Artists, re: pictures for the Tate, with particular attention to Stanley Spencer's Ship-building on the Clyde series.

27. Dennis Farr, English Art, 1870-1940 (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), p.363.

28. Kenneth Clark, Another Part of the Wood: A Self-Portrait (London: John Murray, 1974), p.251.

29. The ultimate destination of each piece of war art is given in: Imperial War Museum, A Concise Catalogue of Paintings, Drawings and Sculpture of the Second World War, 1939-1945 (London: IWM, 1964), although this source does include a few errors.

30. See various documents in: British Council (in PRO): BW 2/405.

31. Reference to Clark's comment is made in a note dated 19 January 1948, stored in the Department of Art (IWM) filing cabinet of papers relevant to the post-war disposal of the WAAC collection (Ministry of Works file).

32. John Rothenstein to Kenneth Clark, 4 February 1941 (GP/46/48).

33. Details about how the Imperial War Museum selected the pictures and sculptures it wanted are outlined in IWM: Standing Committee and Board of Trustees, Minutes of meetings from January to October 1945 (IWM: Central File #B6/1).

34. GP/72/H(3), p.172.

35. Stanley Lees (Treasury) to Miss Dodd (Treasury), 4 March 1947 (GP/72/H(3), p.171).

36. For example: John Hayward, Prose Literature Since 1939 (London/ New York/Toronto: Longmans Green & Co, for the British Council, 1947), p.18.

37. Clark, The Other Half, op.cit.,. p.55.

38. IWM: Sound Records, Artists in an Age of Conflict: Rosemary Allan (tape-recorded interview), reel #2.

39. Alan G. Wilkinson, in Tate Gallery catalogue The Drawings of Henry Moore (London: Tate Gallery, in collaboration with the Art Gallery of Ontario, 1977), especially p.213. Moore's comment is quoted in numerous sources, including Hewison, Under Siege: Literary Life in London 1939-1945 (London/Melbourne/New York: Quartet Books, 1979), p.152.

40. John Rothenstein, "European Painting 1893-1943," Studio, 125 #601 (April-May 1943), pp.110,112.

41. Dartington Hall Trustees, The Visual Arts: A Report Sponsored by the Dartington Hall Trustees (London/New York/Toronto: Geoffrey Cumberlege/Oxford University Press, 1946), p.42.

42. Labour Party, Let Us Face the Future (London: Labour Party, 1945). This document is cited in Frances Borzello, Civilising Caliban: The Misuse of Art 1875-1980 (London/New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987), p.129.

### Afterword

This thesis has been premised upon the belief that the War Artists' Advisory Committee was important to the history of British art, both during the War and afterwards. Yet, as the introduction indicates, the Committee has been the subject of remarkably little serious study.

Certainly one reason for this is rooted in the advanced state of recording media during the Second World War. In an age of newsreels and Leica cameras the very idea of commissioning or purchasing some 6000 drawings, paintings, prints and sculptures of wartime events and personalities seemed, to many, a pointless exercise. For recording violence on such a scale photography and film were (and are) often seen as more appropriate media because of their presumably objective accuracy and because they are supposedly unhindered by much of the ideological baggage of the humanism that is associated with the traditional fine arts. As Michael Rothenstein noted during the War while lecturing to Army troops on the subject of art, the soldiers in his audiences could see little point in employing artists to record the conflict when photography seemed to them a much more suitable medium.<sup>1</sup>

Yet this alone cannot account for the overall critical neglect of the WAAC. The Committee was not, in the final analysis, important primarily as a collector of historical records. Rather, it was an experiment in state support of

contemporary art in a society in which the state and the arts had usually been on distant terms. As a marker and a catalyst of change in British social history the WAAC was a body of decisive importance. Why, then, has its critical treatment been so sporadic?

The assertion (first made during the War itself) that most WAAC art does not attain a sufficiently high level of aesthetic or emotional interest, is inadequate as an explanation. Several artists who are now exhibited comparatively seldom had imposing reputations in 1939-1945. Clearly, therefore, their work is not inherently or irredeemably uninteresting. It might, however (if seen from a modernist vantage point), be described as unadventurous. The latter adjective contains within itself an important explanation for the longstanding critical neglect of a large number of the WAAC's artists, and of the work of the Committee itself.

As the title of Charles Harrison's English Art and Modernism, 1900-1939<sup>2</sup> implies, the progress of modernism in Britain encountered an obstacle in the form of the outbreak of the War. The latter was a watershed in British art, cutting the country off from Europe and throwing it back upon its own resources. Critics (for reasons suggested earlier in this thesis) lavished their attention upon the notion of the resurgence of what were assumed to be innately British characteristics in the fine arts. The 1930's debate (exemplified by the art of Paul Nash) between international modernism and

"British" art, was temporarily weighted in favour of the latter.

With the return of peace, however, internationalism regained and held some of its lost ground.<sup>3</sup> Immediately after the War journalists were astonished at the long queues of people waiting to see exhibitions of work by Picasso and Matisse. As international modernism increasingly became a point of interest again in the immediate post-war years, even a style like Neo-Romanticism could lose interest, and not be the subject of a large exhibition until 1983.<sup>4</sup> In 1986, thirty years after the end of the War, the Royal Academy's large survey and summary of British art in the twentieth century was significantly subtitled "The Modern Movement," and included war art by only four artists: Henry Moore, Graham Sutherland, Paul Nash and David Bomberg.<sup>5</sup>

This is not to imply that the development of modernism is not a subject of great interest and historical importance. Quite the reverse is true, and the study of that development has been well-served in various histories and analyses of twentieth-century British art. However, its prominence in art historical writing has been at the expense of organisations like the WAAC. The war years have tended to be relegated to the status of a hiatus between the controversy-filled art scene of the 1930's and the renewal of contacts between British and international art after 1945. It is significant that, in most discussions of the WAAC, the artists who hold pride of



place are those whose work seems the most modern in appearance (Henry Moore, Paul Nash, Graham Sutherland, John Piper and Stanley Spencer), just as the Vorticists tend to dominate analyses of First World War art. Yet the WAAC gave work to more than four hundred artists, most of whom played comparatively minor parts in the exploration of modernism. The WAAC's very catholicity of taste has perhaps contributed to its slimness of treatment in art historical writing.

Post-modernism's questioning of dominant discourses, and its concomitant emphasis on plurality, encourage the re-evaluation of the writing of art history from the standpoint of the development of style. In addition, contemporary interest in the analysis of power structures within society (an interest encouraged by the rapid development of, for example, feminist and ethnic studies) has sanctioned art historical investigation that goes behind the artworks themselves to ask questions about how they came to exist, and how they functioned within the context of the groups for which they were produced. This development encourages a break with the reluctance of much twentieth-century art history to deal with art institutions and with the ways in which they bring out the complexities around the category of "art." In this light, to regard the years of the Second World War as a time of inconsequential aberration in the history of British art seems to be premised upon the use of inappropriate criteria of evaluation.

This thesis has therefore been an attempt to locate the

WAAC within the social and economic context of the years 1939-1945, and to consider ways in which its approach to art raised questions (about the dividing lines between art and propaganda, for example) that have often been ignored since the end of the War. Such questions have seemed to me profitable avenues of exploration. The decision to avoid discussion of the work of individual artists (except insofar as such discussion illuminates the assumptions and intentions of the WAAC) has therefore been intentional, and not a casual oversight. State patronage, art and the War combined in complex and sometimes unexpected ways, in the light of which the Committee's history and impact may be evaluated. The blizzard of reactions that the WAAC evoked in its day from critics, artists, laypersons and government officials argues in favour of its identification as a multi-layered organisation that will repay further analyses.

Afterword: Endnotes

1. Michael Rothenstein, "'Can We Be Educated Up to Art?': Notes on Lecturing to the Army," Horizon, 7 #40 (April 1943), pp.270-277.

2. Charles Harrison, English Art and Modernism, 1900-1939 (London/Bloomington, Indiana: Allen Lane/Indiana University Press, 1981).

3. Kenneth Clark's own analysis of the virtues and shortcomings of the phenomenon of provincialism is instructive on the subject of the relationship between national and international concerns in art; see Provincialism (England: The English Association, 1962).

4. National Museum of Wales, The British Neo-Romantics, 1935-1950 (Cardiff: National Museum of Wales, 1983).

5. Susan Compton, ed., British Art in the 20th Century: The Modern Movement (London/Munich: Royal Academy of Arts/Prestel-Verlag, 1986).

Appendix 1Artists

This appendix is divided into eight parts: (1) Official War Artists;<sup>1</sup> (2) Artists Given Short-term Contracts; (3) Artists Who Sold Work to the WAAC; (4) Artists Who Donated Work to the WAAC; (5) Artists Who Made Unsuccessful Applications to the WAAC; (6) Other Artists Considered for Employment (two parts; see Chapter 2); (7) Viscount Esher's 1939 List of Artists (see Chapter 2); and (8) Official War Artists' Representation in the Tate Gallery (see Chapter 2). Part 2 includes brief details on the contents of the short-term contracts.

---

<sup>1</sup> If an artist was an official war artist he or she is listed only in this category, regardless of what other relations he or she may have had with the WAAC.

Appendix 1: Part 1Official War Artists:

\* indicates an artist who had experience in the Armed Services during the Second World War, before being made an official war artist.

Edward Ardizzone: War Office Artist, 1940-1945 (b.1900)  
 Edward Bawden: War Office Artist, 1940-1943; Ministry of Information Artist, 1943-1945 (b.1903)  
 Muirhead Bone: Admiralty Artist, 1939-1943 (b.1876)  
 Stephen Bone: Ministry of Information Artist, 1943-1945 (specialisation: Admiralty subjects) (b.1904)  
 Henry Carr: War Office Artist, 1943-1944 (b.1894)  
 William Coldstream\*: War Office Artist, 1943-1945 (b.1908)  
 Leslie Cole: Ministry of Information Artist, 1943 (specialisation: Malta); War Office Artist, 1944-1945 (b.1910)  
 Charles Cundall: Admiralty Artist, 1940-1941; Air Ministry Artist, 1941-1945 (b.1890)  
 William Dring: Ministry of Information Artist, 1942-1944 (specialisation: Admiralty portraits); Air Ministry Artist, 1944-1945 (b.1904)  
 Evelyn Dunbar: Ministry of Information Artist, 1943-1944 (specialisation: agricultural and women's subjects) (b.1906)  
 Richard Eurich: Admiralty Artist, 1941-1945 (b.1903)  
 Reginald Eves: War Office Artist, 1940 (b.1876)  
 Barnett Freedman: War Office Artist, 1940-1941 (b.1901)  
 Anthony Gross: War Office Artist, 1941-1945 (b.1905)  
 Bernard Hailstone: Ministry of Information Artist, 1940-1941 (specialisation: Ministry of Supply portraits); Ministry of War Transport Artist, 1943-1945; Ministry of Information Artist, 1945 (specialisation: South-East Asia Command subjects) (b.1910)  
 Keith Henderson: Air Ministry Artist, 1940 (b.1883)  
 Thomas Hennell: Ministry of Information Artist, 1943-1944 (specialisation: Iceland and Admiralty subjects); Air Ministry Artist, 1945 (b.1903)  
 Eric Kennington: Air Ministry Artist, 1940-1942 (b.1888)  
 Henry Lamb: War Office Artist, 1940-1944 (b.1883)  
 W.T. Monnington: Ministry of Information Artist, 1943-1945 (specialisation: Air Ministry subjects) (b.1903)  
 James Morris\*: Admiralty Artist, 1945 (b.1908)  
 Rodrigo Moynihan\*: Ministry of Information Artist, 1943-1944 (specialisation: War Office portraits) (b.1910)  
 John Nash: Ministry of Information Artist, 1940 (specialisation: Admiralty subjects) (b.1893)  
 Paul Nash: Air Ministry Artist, 1940 (b.1889)  
 Mervyn Peake: Ministry of Information Artist, 1943

(specialisation: Ministry of Production subjects)  
(b.1911)

John Piper: Ministry of Information Artist, 1944-1945  
(specialisation: Ministry of Home Security and general subjects); Ministry of War Transport Artist, 1944-1945  
(b.1903)

Roland Vivian Pitchforth: Ministry of Information Artist, 1940-1941, 1942-1943 (specialisation: Ministries of Supply and Home Security subjects); Admiralty Artist, 1943-1945 (b.1895)

John Platt: Ministry of War Transport Artist, 1943-1944  
(b.1886)

Eric Ravillious: Ministry of Information Artist, 1940, 1941-1942 (specialisation: Admiralty subjects) (b.1903)

Albert Richards\*: War Office Artist, 1944-1945 (b.1919)

Leonard Rosoman: Ministry of Information Artist, 1945  
(specialisation: Admiralty and other subjects) (b.1913)

Rupert Shephard: Ministry of War Transport Artist, 1945  
(b.1909)

Graham Sutherland: Ministry of Information Artist, 1940-1945  
(Ministries of Supply, Home Security and Production subjects) (b.1903)

A.R. Thomson: Air Ministry Artist, 1942-1944 (b.1894)

Carel Weight\*: War Office Artist, 1945 (b.1908)

Charles Wheeler: Ministry of Information Artist, 1942-1943  
(specialisation: Admiralty portrait busts) (b.1892)

John Worsley\*: Admiralty Artist, 1943-1944 (b.1919)

Appendix 1: Part 2Artists Given Short-term Contracts:<sup>2</sup>

\* indicates an artist who also sold work to the WAAC; see the following section.

Rosemary Allan (b.1911)	Charles Ginner (b.1879)
Leonard Appelbee (b.1914)	Duncan Grant (b.1885)
John Armstrong (b.1893)*	James Grant (b.1887?)
Robert Austin (b.1895)	Kenneth Green (b.1916)
Edward Baird (b.1904)	James Gunn (b.1893)
Malcolm Baker-Smith*	Robin Guthrie (b.1902)
James Bateman (b.1893)	Alan Gwynne-Jones (b.1892)*
Walter Bayes (b.1869)	Clifford Hall (b.1904)*
Frank Beresford (b.1881)	Archibald Hartrick (b.1864)
Oswald Birley (b.1880)*	Norman Hepple (b.1908)*
David Bomberg (b.1890)	C. Eliot Hodgkin (b.1905)
Rodney Burn (b.1899)	Percy Horton (b.1897)
Thomas Carr (b.1909)*	Ray Howard-Jones (b.1903)*
Bernard Casson*	B. Hughes-Stanton (b.1902)*
Evan Charlton (b.1904)	F. Ernest Jackson (b.1872)
Derek Chittock (b.1922)	Edmond Kapp (b.1890)*
Dora Clarke (b.1895)	Mary Kessell (b.1914)*
William Clause (b.1887)*	Laura Knight (b.1877)
Dorothy Coke (b.1897)	Percy Wyndham Lewis (b.1882)
Robert Colquhoun (b.1914)	L.S. Lowry (b.1887)*
Philip Connard (b.1875)	Lowes Luard (b.1872)*
William Conor (b.1884)*	Neville Lytton (b.1879)
James Cowie (b.1886)	Frances Macdonald (b.1914)*
Raymond Coxon (b.1896)	A. Macpherson (b.1904)*
Barry Craig*	Raymond McGrath (b.1903)
Hugh Crawford (b.1898)	Robert Medley (b.1905)
Terence Cuneo (b.1907)	Bernard Meninsky (b.1891)
Robin Darwin (b.1910)	Paul Methuen (b.1886)*
Anthony Devas (b.1911)*	James Miller (b.1893)*
Frank Dobson (b.1888)*	Henry Moore (b.1898)*
Francis Dodd (b.1874)*	Mona Moore (b.1917)
Paul Drury (b.1903)*	Harry Morley (b.1881)
T.C. Dugdale (b.1880)*	W.P. Moss*
C.W. Dyson-Smith (b.1891)	Cuthbert Orde (b.1888)*
Ian Eadie*	Charles Pears (b.1873)*
Arthur James Ensor (b.1905)*	Patrick E. Phillips (b.1907)
Jacob Epstein (b.1880)*	Elizabeth Polunin (b.1878)
Vincent Lines (b.1896)*	Patricia Preece (b.1900)
Hubert Freeth (b.1912)*	William Roberts (b.1895)
Ethel Gabain (b.1882)*	Claude Rogers (b.1907)
Evelyn Gibbs (b.1905)*	Kenneth Rowntree (b.1915)*

<sup>2</sup> See also Appendix 5: Artists' Contracts.

Henry Rushbury (b.1889)\*  
Walter Russell (b.1867)  
Randolph Schwabe (b.1885)\*  
Peter Markham Scott (b.1909)  
Robert Sivell (b.1889)  
John Skeaping (b.1906)  
Alan Sorrell (b.1904)\*  
Ruskin Spear (b.1911)\*  
Gilbert Spencer (b.1892)

Stanley Spencer (b.1891)\*  
Steven Spurrier (b.1878)  
David M. Sutherland (b.1883)  
E. Heber Thompson (b.1891)  
A.R. Middleton Todd (b.1891)  
Feliks Topolski (b.1907)\*  
John Wheatley (b.1892)\*  
Harold Williamson (b.1892)  
W. Matvyn Wright (b.1910)



Appendix 1: Part 3Artists Who Sold Work to the WAAC:<sup>3</sup>

Enid Abrahams	Daphne Chart (b.1909)
L. Abrahams (b.1920/1921)	Malvina Cheek (b.1915)
G. Worsley Adamson (b.1913)	George Claessen (b.1909)
Mary Adshead (b.1904)	Joy Collier
Edgar Ainsworth (b.1905)	A.C. Collins
Griselda Allan (b.1905)	Joan Connew (b.1915)
Kathleen Saywell Allen (b.1906)	Frederick Cook (b.1907)
Adrian Allinson (b.1890)	Hubert Cook (b.1901)
Joshua Armitage (b.1913)	J. Kingsley Cook
Michael Ayrton (b.1921)	(b.1911)
E. Bainbridge-Copnall (b.1903)	Frederick Coventry
Denis Barnham (b.1920)	(b.1905)
Joseph Bato (b.1888)	Raymond Cowerne (b.1913)
Ivor Beddoes (b.1909)	H.R. Cox
Bernard Beekes	B.J. Cumming (b.1910)
John Berry (b.1920)	Peter Curl (b.1921)
D.S. Bertram	J.S. Dalison
Paul Bird (b.1923)	A.D. Daniels
B.V. Bishop	Leonard Daniels (b.1909)
Douglas Bissett (b.1908)	W.D. Brokman Davis
George Bissill (b.1896)	(b.1892)
Sam Black (b.1913)	Miles de Montmorency
Doris Blair	(b.1893)
R. Henderson Blyth (b.1919)	Paul Dessau (b.1909)
A. Boothroyd	John Dixon
James Boswell (b.1906)	Louis Duffy
A.C. Bown	F. Dunbar-Marshall
Oliver Brabbins (b.1912)	Charles Dunn (b.1899)
William Brealey (b.1889)	Pamela Dunton
J. Brooks (b.1922/1923)	Alan Durst (b.1883)
John Brown (b.1915)	Gil Dyer
Kenneth G. Browne	Eric Earnshaw
Maurice Brownfoot	G.O. Eldridge (b.1916)
Harold Bubb	Clifford Ellis (b.1907)
Norma Bull (b.1906)	F. Elwell (b.1870)
William Burwell (b.1911)	Simon Elwes (b.1902)
Robert Butler (b.1916)	L. Faithfull (b.1898)
Robert Campbell	John Farleigh (b.1900)
Patrick Carpenter (b.1920)	David Feilding
Jack Chaddock (b.1920/1921)	V. Ferguson
D. Champion	Frank Field
Miles Chance	D. Flanders (b.1905)
Charles Chaplin (b.1907)	F.M.R. Flint (b.1915)

<sup>3</sup> See also names marked with asterisks in the preceding section.

Victorine Foot (b.1920)	L.E.D. Keene
Michael Ford (b.1920)	Cedric J. Kennedy
Mollie Forestier-Walker (b.1912)	James Kenward (b.1908)
Meredith Frampton (b.1894)	B. Ley Kenyon (b.1913)
Thomas Freeth (b.1912)	M. Kestelman (b.1905)
Roger Furse (b.1903)	C. Kestin
Abram Games (b.1914)	S. Kioni
G.R. Geary	Eve Kirk (b.1900)
A.H. Gerrard (b.1899)	T.E. La Dell (b.1914)
Mrs. K. Gerrard	G. Lambourn (b.1900)
Patrick Gierth	Akinola Lasekan
Paul Gillett	Nora Lavrin
Grace Golden (b.1904)	Lawrence S. Lee
W. Goodin	V.J. Lee
Thomas Gourdie (b.1913)	Olga Lehmann
Frank Graves (b.1913)	Vincent Lines (b.1909)
A.A. Gregson	A.K. Lugolobi
Julius Griffith (b.1912)	Richard Macdonald
Kathleen Guthrie (b.1905)	W. Douglas Macleod
Karl Hagedorn (b.1889)	(b.1892)
Harold Hailstone (b.1897)	P.W.G. Maloba
W.S. Haines (b.1905)	John Mansbridge (b.1911)
Eric L. Hall	Norman A. Mansbridge
Patrick Hall (b.1906)	(b.1911)
Thomas Halliday (b.1902)	E. Mansfield (b.1907)
H.L. Harcourt	Charles Marsden (b.1919)
Hilda Harrisson	Frank H. Mason (b.1875)
Carl Haworth (b.1911)	Denis Mathews (b.1913)
Rudolf Haybrook (b.1898)	J. McCulloch (b.1893)
Colin Hayes (b.1919)	Herbert McWilliams
J.C. Heath (b.1915)	(b.1907)
Francis Helps	G. Melhuish (b.1916)
Rose Henriques	H.S. Merritt (b.1884)
Elsie Hewland (b.1901)	Robert Miller
L. Hinshelwood	Reginald Mills
Francis Hodge	V. Baber Mimpriss
Kenneth Holmes (b.1902)	Louis Mitelle (b.1919)
Francis Holtermann (b.1920)	Colin Moss (b.1914)
Stanley Houghton	C. Mozley
Blair Howitt-Lodge (b.1883)	Brian Mullen (b.1911)
Eleanor Erlund Hudson (b.1912)	John Munday
Ruth Hurle	Charles Murray (b.1894)
Mabel Hutchinson (b.1918)	Richard Murry (b.1902)
Philip Hutton	E.B. Musman
Alex Ingram	John Napper (b.1916)
Edward James	Edmund Nelson (b.1910)
Norman Janes (b.1892)	C.R.W. Nevinson (b.1889)
H. Johns	Roger Nicholson
Barbara Jones	Roy Nockolds (b.1911)
G.W. Kairigo	L. Noke
Katongale	Frank Norton
Pegaret Keeling	G. Obath

S. Okello  
 G.W. Lennox Paterson (b.1915)  
 T.W. Pattison (b.1894)  
 Edward Payne (b.1906)  
 R.H. Payne (b.1921)  
 C.J. Pearce  
 Ivan Peries  
 Christopher Perkins (b.1891)  
 Roger Pettiward  
 George Plante (b.1914)  
 Louisa Puller (b.1885)  
 George Quarmby (b.1883)  
 F. Quinton  
 W.T. Rawlinson (b.1912)  
 F. Reed  
 Retziba  
 Ceri Richards (b.1903)  
 Leonard Richmond  
 S. Robertson-Rodgers (b.1916)  
 Alan Ronald (b.1899)  
 Michael Rothenstein (b.1908)  
 William Rothenstein (b.1872)  
 C.A. Russell  
 J.A. Russell (b.1920)  
 C.A. Salisbury  
 Noel Sampson  
 Robert Scanlan (b.1908)  
 Stella Schmolle (b.1908)  
 Edward Seago (b.1910)  
 Richard Seddon (b.1915)  
 E. Shepherd (b.1916)  
 B. Gordon Smith  
 David T. Smith (b.1920)  
 Sidney Smith (b.1912)  
 Alexander Sonnis (b.1905)  
 J.M. Spence  
 John Staerck (b.1919)  
 Julius Stafford-Baker (b.1904)  
 P.T. Stainforth  
 John Stephenson (b.1889)  
 Juan Stoll

Strang, Ian (b.1886)  
 Felicity Sutton  
 I.K. Sydee (b.1914)  
 Eric W. Taylor (b.1909)  
 Richard Taylor (b.1924)  
 Patrick Thompson  
 N.B. Town  
 Julian Trevelyan (b.1910)  
 E. Trimnell-Richard  
 Henry Trivick (b.1908)  
 G.A. Tuckwell  
 C.C. Turner  
 E. Boye Uden (b.1911)  
 Clive Upton (b.1911)  
 Keith Vaughan (b.1912)  
 Paule Vezelay (b.1892)  
 S. Curnow Vosper (b.1866)  
 F.C. Ward (b.1914)  
 John Ward (b.1917)  
 William Ware (b.1915)  
 William Washington  
 (b.1885)  
 Aubrey Waterfield  
 Barbara Watson  
 G.P.H. Watson (b.1887?)  
 A.M. Weston  
 Garth Weston (b.1914)  
 Peter Whalley  
 Tom White (b.1912)  
 G.W. Whittam  
 Kaete Wilczynski (b.1894)  
 Norman Wilkinson (b.1878)  
 Anne F. Wilson (b.1927)  
 J. Wood  
 Frank Wootton (b.1911)  
 E.J. Worrall  
 H.W. Yates (b.1916)  
 J. Yunge-Bateman  
 A. Zabalam  
 Anna Zinkeisen (b.1901)  
 Doris Zinkeisen (b.1898)

Appendix 1: Part 4Artists Who Donated Work to the WAAC:

\* indicates an artist included in any of the three preceding categories.

Stephen Bone\*  
R.G. Eves\*  
William Russell Flint (b.1880)  
Hubert Freeth\*  
Ethel Gabain\*  
Phyllis Ginger (b.1907)  
Anthony Gross\*  
Harold Hailstone\*  
Martin Hardie (b.1875)  
Ray Howard-Jones\*  
W. Douglas Macleod\*  
Paul Methuen\*  
Charles Murray\*  
Herbert Olivier (b.1861)  
George Quarmby\*  
William Rothenstein\*  
E. Heber Thompson\*  
Norman Wilkinson\*

Appendix 1: Part 5Artists Who Made Unsuccessful Applications to the WAAC:

Abernathy, (Miss) V.	5 January 1944
Abrahams, Carl	29 October 1944
Adam/Adams, (Mr.) F.D.	29 July 1940
Adams, (Mr.)	12 January 1944
Adams, F. Danton	8 February 1940
Adams, (Miss) E. Proby	19 December 1939
Adamson, Sydney	23 July 1941
Adburyham, Sylvia	15 March 1945
Adelman, (Gunner) I.	8 November 1945
Agar, Eileen	17 January 1941
Ainsworth, (Mr.) E.	24 August 1940
Airy, Anna	27 December 1939
Airy/Airey, Jack L.	1 January 1940
Aitchison, (Mr.) M.H.	22 October 1941
Alexander, (Mr.) C.J.	29 September 1943
Alexander, (Cdr.) Guy B. (retired)	18 December 1939
Alford, (Miss) I.	19 January 1942
Allen, Eric J.	December 1939
Allen, (Mrs.) E. Glenn	7 January 1943
Allen, Harvey	16 December 1939
Allsop, (Miss) L.	27 June 1942
Alston, Rowland	20 November 1939
Amarasekara, (Mr.) A.C.G.s.	n.d.
Ambler, (Mr.) C. Gifford	5 August 1942
Aminoff, Essia	22 February 1945
Anderson, (Miss) Madeleine E.	7 June 1940
Andrews, (O/S) Frank	2 January 1942
Andrews, (Miss) Sybil	10 July 1940
Anman, (Lieut.) C.M.	17 March 1944
Apleby, (Mr.) W.J.	30 August 1945
Archer, Frank	20 November 1939
Arden, (Mr.)	November 1939
Armour, (Miss) Hazel	7 September 1940
Armstrong, Frank	4 March 1943
Arora, (Mr.) J.F.	24 May 1944
Arrobus, (Mr.) S.	28 March 1945
Arrowsmith, Arthur	16 December 1939
Ashborne, (Miss) R.	18 December 1939
Askew, (Lieut.) Victor	1944
Atkins, (O/Tel) R.C.	16 April 1943
Atkins, Charles F.	10 January 1944
Atkinson, (Mr.) P.E.	23 October 1940
Attridge, (Aux.) E.	4 January 1940
Atwood, (Miss) Clare	6 January 1940
Auerbach, Arnold	17 November 1939
Auton, (Gunner) Dennis	31 January 1941
Ayling, George	24 February 1941

Ayrton, Maxwell	24 March 1941
Badham, Leslie.	16 December 1939
	24 February 1941
Badmin, (Mr.) S.R.	22 January 1940
Bagnall, (Mr.) C. Freeth	6 December 1944
Bailey, Jean E.	16 November 1942
Bailey, Wilfred	30 August 1942
Baily, (Dom) Theodore	23 March 1942
Baird, James	10 May 1941
Baker, (Lieut. Col.) B.G.	17 November 1939
Baker, (Miss) C.M.	6 January 1943
Baker, Gerard	30 April 1940
Balston, (Major) T.	19 November 1942
Bannister, Charles H.	20 December 1939
Barber, (Aircraftman) Norman	14 May 1942
Barker, (Private) A. Gordon	16 June 1944
Barker, (Miss) A. Margery	20 November 1941
Barlow, Arthur	8 March 1940
Barnard (Mr.)	May 1944
Barnard, Gwen	11 February 1941
Barnes, Allen E.	5 March 1940
Barnes, Jefferson	5 February 1940
Barnes, (Mr.) R.H.	10 July 1944
Barnett, (Lieut.) Olaf	1 December 1941
	25 October 1944
Barnett, W. Durac	4 February 1941
Barnicot, (Mr.) N.A.	27 October 1943
Barney[?], J.G.	25 February 1940
Barraclough, (Mr.) J. Penniston	2 January 1940
Barrington, John S.	1 September 1940
Barrow, (Major) David de S. (deceased)	10 October 1945
Barry, (Mrs.) Baraara	September 1942
Bartlett, (Lieut. Cmdr.) R.A.	18 June 1942
Bateman, (Mr.) H.M.	10 May 1941
Bates, (Mr.) Fison	18 August 1942
Bates, (Private) Maxwell	January 1940
Bathurst, Charles J.	11 December 1942
Batstone, (Mr.) (H.)W.	20 November 1940
Batten, (Mr.) E.H.	16 December 1939
Baxter, David A.	3 January 1940
Bayes, Gilbert	18 August 1940
Bayncs, (Mr.) [sic]	August 1940
Baynes, (Cadet Rating) A.E.G.	8 December 1941
	20 February 1944
Baynes, John	2 January 1940
Bazeley, (Major) A. Geoffrey	13 August 1944
Beach, Letitia Hicks	14 December 1939
Beaman, Arthur R.	18 December 1939
Beard, (Miss) Kate	17 December 1939
Beards, Harold	28 June 1941

Beaton, (Mr.) T.A.	17 December 1939
Beaumont, Frederick S.	28 February 1940
Beavan, (Mr.) E.H.	1 January 1940
Beavis, (Sapper) W.	14 October 1941
Beck, (Mr.) S.E.	12 January 1940
Bedford, (Gunner) R.D.	31 January 1941
Beed, S.J.	n.d.
Beever, (Miss) Joyce	26 September 1941
Beer, (Mr.) S.	28 February 1945
Bell, David	14 January 1940
Bell, F.C.	5 March 1944
Bell, (Capt.) M.C. Farrar	29 September 1943
Bell, Reginald	18 July 1942
Bellingham-Smith, (Miss) E.	16 July 1942
Benbon (Benbow?), Richard	3 January 1940
Benfield, Eric	29 September 1944
Benham, Herbert	18 December 1939
Bentin, (Lance Bombardier)	22 October 1941
Beresford, (Mr.) S.	20 January 1943
Berlin, Sven	6 February 1945
Berrie, John A.A.	16 December 1939
Berry, Winifred	21 August 1941
Bessanyi, (Mr.?)	27 December 1939
Bevan, E. Roland	7 August 1941
Biggs, John R.	26 September 1941
Binder, (Mrs.) Pearl	9 January 1940
Birchall, (Mr.) W.M.	26 December 1939
Bird, James Lindsay	29 December 1939
Bishop, Edward	3 September 1942
Bishop, (Miss) Molly	8 November 1943
	22 December 1943
Bishop, Peter	7 January 1941
Blackie, (Miss) Rosemary	3 February 1940
Blakeman, May	30 June 1942
Bland, Rupert Roger	14 March 1940
Bliss, Douglas Percy	8 March 1940
Bloch, Martin	29 May 1941
Blomfield, (Flight-Lieut.) A.	31 January 1941
Bloxam, (Miss) Joan	28 December 1939
Blum, (Miss) Gertrude	2 November 1944
Bodley, (Capt.) Josselin	16 December 1939
Bone, (Mr.) L.C.	August 1941
Boon, (Mr.) P.H.	30 May 1945
Booth, Augustin	9 December 1940
Borrowman, (Lieut. Col.) C.G.	5 November 1942
Bosworth, Doris	SEE: DORIS GOAMAN
Botcherley, Harold	23 December 1939
Bottomley, (Mr.) A.E.	18 February 1943
Bouhey, (Mr.) E.A.	20 June 1942
Boulton-Maude, (Mrs.) Doris	26 July 1940
	8 January 1944
Bowden, (Mrs. Max) Shiela	March 1943

Bowen, P.	22 February 1941
Bowen, (Miss) Stella	3 April 1942
	3 July 1944
Bowerman, Bernard J.W.	5 July 1942
Bowes, (Mr.) R.B.	28 January 1941
Bowman, Frank	6 July 1945
Boxer, (Gunner) J.H.	19 June 1942
Boyce, Eric A.	15 January 1940
Boyd, Grace	SEE: GRACE HUXTABLE
Boyle, (Miss) Alicia	29 August 1943
Boys, Mabel	12 August 1941
	11 December 1944
Boyton, Charles	August 1942
Bradbury, Arthur	18 December 1939
	7 April 1941
	8 January 1942
Bradbury, (Sapper) Laurence	25 May 1943
	October 1943
	26 November 1943
	5 December 1943
	21 May 1944
Bradford, (Miss) Dorothy E.	16 April 1940
Bradford, (Mr.) P.W.	7 December 1940
Bradley, Margaret	August 1942
Bradshaw, Stanley O.	3 December 1939
Brandon, (Mr.) C.	December 1944
Brannan, Noel R.	29 March 1944
Branson, Clive	26 January 1942
Bray, (Miss) Phyllis	September 194_
	December 1942
Brenner, Taylor	10 November 1944
Brewitt, R.	16 June 1942
Briault, Sidney	19 October 1939
	26 February 1940
Brierley, R.A.	18 December 1939
Bright, (Miss) Laura	10 January 1940
Brill, Frederick	21 March 1943
Briscoe, Arthur	17 December 1939
Brodzky, Horace	19 December 1939
	May 1941
	c.July 1941
Bromley, (Signalman) K.	2 October 1942
Brooke, H.	5 March 1940
	29 March 1943
Brooke, (Miss) Iris	July 1940
	July 1942
Brooker, Peter	8 January 1940
Brooks, (Mrs.) Mary	4 July 1942
Brookshaw, Drake	20 July 1940
	January 1941
	January 1942
	September 1942



Brouncker, (Miss) Ista	February 1944
Brown, Anthony	16 May 1940
	10 June 1940
	24 January 1941
Brown, Gregory	19 December 1939
Brown, (Gunner) John C.	20 October 1943
Brown, Tim	May 1941
	5 November 1941
Browne, (Miss) Hilda	3 January 1941
Browne, (Miss) K.	June 1942
Browne, (Miss) Kathleen	August 1944
Bruce, A.R.	29 April 1940
	July 1943
	8 October 1943
Buchanan, (L/ACW) Lilian R.	28 July 1944
Buckley, H.	10 March 1941
Buckley, Sydney	29 January 1940
Buday, Mr.	2 January 1941
Budd, Herbert A.	September 1942
Buhler, Robert	18 December 1939
	September 1942
Bunyan, A.	24 December 1939
Burgess, Arthur J.W.	15 July 1940
Burgess, Frederick	15 December 1939
	2 July 1940
	5 December 1940
Burleigh, (Section Officer) Miss/Mrs. V.	January 1942
Burnand, G.N.	15 December 1939
	12 February 1940
	April 1942
	December 1943
Burton, Charles	22 January 1940
Butler, A.G.S.	April 1941
	29 September 1941
	August 1942
Butler, A.L.	16 December 1939
Butler, J.(?; S.?) Somerset	December 1939
Butterberg, A.V.	26 December 1939
	9 February 1940
Butterfield, Francis	16 December 1939
Cable, (Mr.) Lindsay	15 July 1940
	27 July 1940
	2 August 1940
	2 November 1942
	5 October 1944
Cain, Charles W.	20 December 1939
Caine, C.	16 January 1940
Calligan, Edwin	February 1940
Callum, W.H.W.	January 1944
Cameron, Donald B.	15 October 1940

Cameron, (Cpl.) John	21 December 1939
Campbell, Arthur W.	8 June 1942
Campbell, Elizabeth	May 1942
	14 July 1942
Campbell, (Miss) Helen McDougall	16 December 1939
Campion, (Miss) Mary	18 June 1941
Caney, Joanna	January 194
Canning-Freeman, Edward	31 January 1941
Cantor, R.A.	17 December 1939
Capey, Albert	2 January 1940
Caplin, J.	March 1943
Carey, Cecil	6 September 1941
Carline, Richard C.	21 April 1940
Carlton, (Cadet L.A.C.)	July 1943
Carman, (Mr.) W.Y.	31 December 1939
Carr, A.E.J.	15 December 1939
Carr, David	16 December 1939
	April 1941
	August 1941
	January 1942
	December 1942
	18 May 1943
Carr, Robyn Comyns	29 January 1943
Carson, R. Taylor	29 April 1942
Carter, Donald M.	16 December 1939
Carter, Frederick	26 April 1941
Carter, Vivian D.	23 November 1941
Castle, (Miss) Florence E.	27 October 1941
Causser, Sidney	16 December 1939
Chalet, D.H.	6 March 1942
Chalker, (Mr.)	16 March 1942
Chambers, Louis R.	28 December 1939
Chamier, Valerie	20 April 1944
	June 1944
Chandler, R.M.	16 December 1939
Chandler-Thomson, (Miss) Kate	18 December 1939
	9 February 1940
	1 April 1940
Chaplin, Adrienne L.	12 January 1940
Chapman, (Private) Charles D.	3 February 1940
Chapman, S.H.	25 June 1941
	July 1941
	September 1941
Charles, (Miss) C.L.	9 February 1940
Charles, David	16 December 1939
Charlton, (Mrs.) Daphne	30 November 1942
Chavel, Miles	1 January 1945
Chisholm, T.A.	16 December 1939
Christie, Alexander	October 1941
	August 1943
Clark, Cosmo	September 1943
Clark, (Mrs.) Jean	June 1943

Clark, John	15 August 1941
Clark, Norman	16 December 1939
Clark, (F/Lieut.) P. Lindsey	August 1943
Clark, Winston R.	19 February 1943
Clarke, Derek	February 1944
Clarke, Selwyn M.	10 January 1940
Clay, (Miss) Beryl	17 December 1939
	June 1943
	November 1943
	May 1944
	January 1945
Clayton, Harold E.S.	14 January 1940
Cleaver, (L/Cpl.) F.G.	9 August 1941
Clifford, Faith	6 October 1942
Clough, (Lieut.) T.C.	May 1945
Coates, (Mrs.) George	SEE: DORA MEESON
Cobb, (Lieut.) C.D.	October 1944
	March 1945
	July 1945
Codner, Maurice	April 1941
	June 1941
	November 1942
Codner, (Capt.) J.W.	10 August 1944
Cochrane, (Mrs.) Helen	25 March 1941
Cohen, (Lady)	February 1944
Colahan, Colin	December 1941
Coldstream, (Mrs.)	SEE: NANCY SHARP
Coleman, (Miss) D.J.	20 August 1945
Coleman, H.M.	17 December 1939
Collard, John	26 February 1940
Colles, (F/O) Dorothy	15 October 1944
Collings, Albert H.	16 December 1939
Collins, (A/C 2)	June 1942
Collins, J.	21 January 1943
Colquhoun, Ithell	18 March 1941
	May 1941
Colwell, (2nd Lieut.) F.N.	15 September 1942
Conrade, Alfred C.	31 July 1941
Cook, Brian	22 December 1939
Cook, Frederick H.	15 December 1939
Cook, James	August 1940
Cook, (Mr.) R. Crosby	18 December 1939
Cook, Walter J.R.	1 March 1940
	17 October 1940
Cooke, Ida	9 February 1941
Coombs, R.M.	29 December 1939
Cooper, (Capt.) A. Egerton	24 February 1941
Cooper, David	November 1942
	August 1943
Cooper, John	23 January 1941
Cooper, (Mr.) L.J.	30 October 1941
Copnall, Frank T.	17 December 1939

Corfield, Charles C.	19 May 1941
Cornwall, Bruce	November 1940
Cornwell, (R/O) Arthur Bruce	June 1943
Cosmann, (Miss) Milein	January 1943
Cottrell, (Lieut.) Paul	6 October 1942
Coverley-Price	27 September 1944
Cowan, Ralph	25 August 1945
Cox, E.A.	8 February 1940
Cranshaw, Vincent	February 1940
Craxton, John	December 1941
Crinon, Oscar L.	4 February 1940
Crocket, John	22 March 1944
	September 1944
Cronyn, (Lieut.) Hugh	February 1944
Crosby, F. Gordon	30 December 1939
Crosby, H.A.	24 April 1940
Crossley, R.	29 January 1941
Crowther, (Signalman) D.S.	5 September 1943
	31 October 1944
Cullen(?), Joseph W.	11 October 1940
Cullen, T.G.	10 October 1940
Cumming, (Mrs.) Skeoch	30 June 1943
Cunningham, (Miss) Vera	March 1940
	August 1941
Currie, Winefride	23 January 1941
Currimbhoy, (Mr.) Mohamedali F.	July 1941
	13 July 1941
	August 1941 (?)
	5 October 1941
	March 1942
Curteis, William	April 1942
Curtis Green, W.	May 1941
Cuthbertson, (Mr.) W.A.	31 December 1939
Daintrey, Adrian	January 1940
	22 November 1944
Dakin, (Mrs.) M.D.	30 April 1942
Dalby, Arthur	6 February 1940 (?)
Dalgleish, Kenneth	27 August 1942
Dallas, Alastair A.K.	14 December 1939
	13 November 1940
	26 August 1941
	10 November 1942
Daniel, Vincent S.	October 1941
Danielli, Richard	23 September 1941
Daniels, (Mrs.) Leonard	SEE: JOAN RAPAPORT
Darking, (Sgt.) H.F.	February 1945
Darwin, Robert Vere	22 December 1939
Davenport, L.	30 August 1944
Davenport, (Miss) L.	July 1941
David, G.T. Le M.	8 July 1942

Davidson, Edward Mill Davidson	n.d.
Davidson, (Mr.) Jo [sic]	9 February 1944
Davidson, (Dr.) W.E.F.	31 December 1941
Davie, (Cpl.) L.G.	June 1942
Davies, A.J.	31 December 1939
Davies, Brian L.	16 December 1939
Davies, Roland	19 July 1940
	April 1943
Davies, W. Mitford	26 February 1940
	23 April 1942
Davis, Cyril	8 January 1940
Davis, E.J.	July 1941
Davis, (Mr.) G.H.	20 March 1940
Davis, (Miss) Hilda	October 1943
Davison, Douglas	17 February 1940
Dawes, (Mr.) F.T.	February 1943
	May 1943
Dawes-Smith, P.N.	March 1942
Dawson, Montague	16 December 1939
Dawson, (Mr.) P.	5 March 1945
Deakin, (Miss) Mabel	16 December 1939
Deakins, (Mr.) C.E.	20 June 1941
Deakins, (Gunner) George R.	8 March 1944
Dearnley, Alexander	13 March 1944
Deeley, Geoffrey Hampton	4 March 1940
de Bertouch, (Baron)	5 June 1943
de Langley, (Mrs.)	May 1941
	February 1942
	March 1943
Delderfield, (Mr.) W.	May 1944
de Meric, (Miss) Rosalie E.	16 June 1941
Denton, William	29 August 1940
de Pinto, Rufus J.N.	26 October 1942
d'Eqville, (Capt.) A.H.	24 March 1940
de Glehn, (Mr.) W.G.	6 April 1940
de Streuve, (Miss) Ellen	August 1941
Deykin, (Lieut.) H.C.	30 March 1941
	18 July 1942
Diggle, (Miss) Jane L.	20 November 1942
Disher, (Mrs.) Eve	May 1940
	May 1941
	11 December 194
Dixon, (Gunner) L.M.C.	20 September 1940
----- (L/Bdr.)	9 July 1941
	15 December 1941
----- (Sergeant)	11 May 1942
Dixon, (S/Sgt.) W.M.	7 July 1944
Doar, (Miss) M.(?) Wilson	18 July 1940
Dobbie, (Lady)	1 October 1942
Dobson, (Mr.) Cowan	18 December 1939
Dodd, (Mrs.)	22 April 1940
Dodgson, Cpl. John	16 August 1942

Doggett, Herbert	March 1944
Dolphin, Peter	August 1942
Donaldson, David A.	1 January 1940
Donovan, Phoebe	18 October 1939
	31 December 1939
Doorne, (L/Ac. O.A.C.) J.F.S.	March 1942
----- J.F.S.	March 1944
Dorrell, Antony M.	3 November 1942
Douthwaite, (Mr.) A.S.	28 April 1941
	January 1942
	21 April 1941
Dowd, Leo	November 1942
Downs, George	December 1943
	7 February 1943
Draw, (Lieut.) J.E.	15 May 1942
Dring, C.J.	21 May 1942
	10 May 1944
	June 1941
Drucker, (Miss) Amy	18 February 1944
Drury, (Lieut.) C.E.	June 1945
	27 December 1943
Duncan, Mrs. Ann	4 January 1940
Dunlop, Denis C.	SEE: ALETTA M. LEWIS
Dunlop, (Mrs.)	24 November 1943
Dunstan, Bernard	30 January 1941
Dymond, Reginald J.	
Eade, Edward	January 1940
	11 March 1943
Eadie, Robert	7 February 1940
Earl, (Mr.) J.M.	13 October 1942
Earl, (Mr.) T.P.	16 March 1940
	June 1940
Earle, Dennis	17 January 1944
Early, (Miss) Mabel	12 April 1945
East, Laurence	16 December 1939
Eastman, Frank	1 April 1941
Eastman, (Miss) Mary	August 1941
Eaton, G.S.	14 February 1941
Ediss, (Miss) Caroline M.	July 1941
	August 1941
Edwards, T. Owen	17 April 1942
Egon, (Mr.) N.R.	June 1944
Ellenby, Rose	3 November 1941
Eisner, A.	18 December 1939
Eley, (Countess) Nadja	February 1943
	April 1943
	October 1943
Elgar, (Mrs.) Nigel	23 March 1943
Elgar, (Mrs.) Rosamond	3 December 1941
	11 December 1941
	May 1942

Elliott, (Miss) Laura M.	September 1942
Ellis, A.C.M.	November 1943
Ellis, Rosemary	before February 1940
Ellis, Richard H.	February 1941
Ellison, Irene B.	18 December 1939
Elphinstone, (Miss) Lucy	24 February 1941
Emmanuel, Frank L.	1 January 1940
Ender, (Mr.) P.	October 1941
Engleman, (Mr.) A.	February 1941
English, Edwyn W.	December 1940
Erridge, Arthur T.	March 1941
Erwin, A.	April 1940
Esmonde-White, (Miss) Eleanor	June 1940
Evans, David	26 April 1944
Evans, (L/Bdr.) Peter	17 December 1939
Everard, (Mrs.) Dorothy	16 February 1940
Everest, R.H.	19 December 1939
Ewart, David S.	14 July 1942
Ewing, Edmond Waddy	1 April 1942
	15 September 1941
	February 1944
	15 December 1939
	August 1942
	17 February 1940
Fairclough, (Mr.) W.	6 December 1940
Fairweather, I.A.	16 November 1943
Falconer, (Miss) Agnes T.	30 December 1939
Farlew, (Miss) Jessie	14 April 1942
Farley, Charles W.	29 December 1939
Farr, (Mr.) D.	19 December 1939
Farrar, (Mr.) C.B.	18 December 1939
Faulkner, Richard, Jr.	June 1941
Feibusch, Hans	18 February 1940
Feild, E. Maurice	9 May 1941
Felkel, Carl	10 October 1941
Fell-Clark, (Miss) Pat	June 1941
Fenwick, Ian	18 February 1941
Feraby(?), Brian	23 September 1941
Fieldhouse, (Miss) Florence	9 February 1940
Finlay, (Miss) Anne	19 March 1941
Finney, Hugh A.	11 February 1940
Fisher, (Miss) Myrna(?)	4 July 1942
Fisher, (Miss) P.E.T.	6 March 1941
	April 1943
	6 November 1943
	19 December 1939
	3 March 1943
	October 1943
	December 1944
	January 1945

Fisher, (Capt.) W.L.T.	28 November 1939
Fitzgerald, (Miss; LACW) P.	6 October 1941
Flagg, (S/Ldr.) B.M.	30 May 1945
Fletcher, Geoffrey S.	7 March 1943
Flett, (Lieut.) A.E.C.	30 September 1944
Follett, Norman C.	21 December 1939
Fontaine, (Miss) Carissima	10 April 1942
	7 July 1942
	27 October 1943
	3 November 1943
	19 January 1944
	6 December 1944
	3 January 1945
Foot, (Mr.) Leslie	10 August 1941
Forbes, (Mrs.) Ilrica	21 July 1943
Forbes-Dalrymple, (F/O) Arthur E.)	11 June 1944
Ford, Roland F.S.	10 September 1945
Forster (Mr.)	1 August 1941
Fortey, J.C. Eastland	December 1939
Forward, F. Randall	11 November 1944
Fosdike, (Cpl.) E.A.	3 April 1942
	15 May 1942
Fowler, (Signalman) E.	22 June 1944
Francis, (Mr.) F.	September 1940
Frankl, Gerhard	30 June 1941
Franklyn, Frank L.	16 December 1939
Freedman, (Mrs.) Claudia	October 1941
Freestone, C.	28 November 1942
French, Norman	30 July 1940
Freyhan, Sigismund	23 September 1942
Fricker, Henry James	6 March 1941
	18 August 1943
	16 October 1943
Frith, (Signalman) C.I.	8 February 1944
	December 1944
Frost, (Mr.) G.L.	1 September 1941
	23 January 1942
	7 January 1943
	19 April 1944
Fry, (Lieut.) Malcolm	30 August 1945
Furse, Patrick J.D.	May 1940
Galliano, (Mr.) N.	December 1942
Galloway, (Mr.) R.M.	December 1939
Galt, Alexander M.	3 February 1940
Gammage, (Mr.) R.V.	5 March 1941
(P.O. Coxn.) R.V.	24 February 1942
Gardiner, Joyce	n.d.
Gardner, (Mr.) F.	19 December 1939
	31 January 1941
Gardner, (Miss) Graine S.	February 1945



Garfield, (Mrs.) L.	19 January 1944
Garland, Ann	29 December 1944
Garlick, (Mr.) A.	12 January 1944
Garrard, Bill	7 June 1940
Garside, (Miss) H. Dorothy	14 December 1939
Gaster, (Mr.) H.	8 January 1941
Gauld, John	7 May 1945
Gaunt, (Mr.) W.	30 January 1941
	29 December 1943
Gausden, Sidney	2 April 1941
Gatehouse, (Mr.) H.G.	2 January 1940
Gawthorn, H.G.	1939
Gay, Arthur	January 1943
	February 1944
Geddes, Jean	4 October 1942
Geddes, (Miss) Margaret	1 February 1941
	13 February 1941
	24 May 1941
	11 October 1944
Gentleman, (Mr.) T.	1 January 1940
Gerellond, (Mrs.) Rita C.	30 October 1941
George, (Mr.) G.M.A.J.	1 June 1941
Ghilchik, David L.	18 December 1939
	15 January 1942
Gibbs, (2nd Lieut.) Robert	20 December 1939
	28 March 1941
	22 August 1941
Gibson, (Mr.) K.L.	January 1942
Gilbert, (Mr.) A.A.	4 July 1941
	16 July 1942
Gilbert, Donald	18 March 1942
	9 July 1943
	16 December 1943
	5 May 1944
Gilbert, G.M.	18 December 1939
Gilding, Laurence F.	20 October 1941
	11 November 1941
	May 1944
	May 1945
Giles, Linton	8 July 1940
Gilfillan, Tom	20 December 1939
Gill, (Miss)	September 1941
Gilroy, John	5 August 1941
	28 January 1943
	3 March 1943
Ginnett, Michael	16 October 1944
Ginnett, (L.A.C.) N.C.	30 September 194
Ginsbury, (Mr.) J.W.	20 December 1939
Glass, William Mervyn	26 December 1939
Glemser, Alexander A.	15 January 1940
Glover, Derek	29 December 1939
Gluck, (Mrs.)	11 June 1942

Goaman, (Miss) Doris	31 July 1942
Goddard, Louis C.	23 November 1939
Goldberg, (Gunner) S.	15 January 1942
Goldberger, Arnold	18 April 1941
Golding, William A.	12 June 1941
Goodman, Penelope Everett	18 December 1939
Goodwin, (P/O) Leslie H.	19 December 1939
	June 1940
	7 May 1942
	18 May 1943
	14 November 1943
Gordine, Dora	16 August 1942
Gordon, (Mr.) F.	19 December 1939
Gordon, (Mr.) G.J. (Jan)	n.d.
Gore, Frederick	January 1941
	24 October 1941
	30 October 1940
Gore-Booth, (Mr.) C.R.	March 1944
	6 December 1944
Gough, (Sgt.) T.E.	16 May 1945
Gould, Ann	19 December 1939
Gould, George T.S.	3 December 1940
Gould, Michael Ayrton	14 February 1941
	16 December 1939
Gould, (Miss) Phyllis	14 February 1940
Gow, (Miss) Lucien(?)	March 1945
Gowing, Lawrence	June 1941
Grace, (Mr.) A.L.	4 January 1942
Graham, (P/O) J.L.	2 June 1942
	28 May 1943
Graham, Kenneth L.	18 July 1940
Grant, (Mr.) T.	March 1940
Grant, (Mrs.)	September 1941
Gravett, (Cadet) G.	9 December 1942
Gray, (Mr.) Ferdi P.	30 July 1940
Gray, Ronald	25 January 1940
Greaves, Leonard	20 January 1943
	29 October 1943
Greaves, (Lieut. Col.) S.S.	29 December 1940
Green, (Mr.) G.G.	12 December 1939
Green, Stephen	16 April 1940
Green, (Miss) T.P.F.E.	3 May 1941
Green, W. Curtis	17 December 1939
Greene, W.S. Clayton	2 January 1940
Greenwood, Orlando	2 September 1942
Gregson, (Gunner) V.J.(?; R?)	23 September 1942
	16 April 1943
	November 1944
	21 May 1945
Greig, James	16 November 1939
Griffen, (Mr.) A.F.	16 December 1944
Griffin, Anthony	14 July 1941

Griffiths, B.T.A.G.	16 December 1939
Griffiths, F.G.	14 June 1944
Griggs, (Mr.)	17 April 1940
Grimm, Stanley	17 December 1939
	21 July 1941
Grimshaw, (Mr.) R.	7 September 1941
Grixoni, (Count) Mario	November 1941
Grose, Margaret	24 April 1942
Grundy, John Hall	16 July 1940
	6 December 1940
Grunspan, C.E.	17 December 1939
	2 July 1940
	12 December 1940
Gulliver, (Mr.) T.L.	16 January 1940
Gunn, (Fuselier) H.A.	1 June 1942
	13 May 1943
Guthrie, (Mr.) L. Rome	n.d.
Gwennet, Gunn	24 April 1942
Haagensen, F.H.	14 February 1940
Haas, Helen	6 September 1942
Haddock, (L.A.C.) (Mr.)	12 March 1945
Haddock, (Mr.) J.M.	12 March 1945
Hagreen, Philip	9 April 1940
Haigh, (Miss) Veronica	19 June 1941
Hale, John E.	7 April 1943
Haley, Henry	September 1940
Hall, Arthur H.	18 December 1939
Hall, Maurice	21 August 1942
	9 June 1943
	28 July 1943
	January 1944
	26 October 1944
	7 March 1945
Halliday, Edward	October 1940
Hamerschlag, (Miss) Margareta	3 September 1942
Hamilton, (Sgt. Instr.) A.J.	15 April 1945
Hamilton, (Miss) Belinda	12 April 1940
Hammond, Henry	April 1945
Hampshire, Charles	25 November 1939
Hampshire, (Mr.) G.H.	20 February 1942
Hampton, Richard	April 1945
Hansen, (Mr.)	15 February 1940
Hansford-White, T.	4 June 1945
Hanson-Walker, J.	19 January 1940
	Oct.-Nov. 1945
	April 1944
Hardy, (L/Cpl.) Cecil	20 March 1944
Hardy, Wilfred	October 1941
Hare, (Miss) Muriel	September 1942
Harle, Dennis F.	18 September 1942
Harle, Dennis L.	

Harley, W. Ronald	19 December 1939
Harmar, (Miss) Fairlie	22 July 1940
	24 August 1942
Harnack, F.B.	7 January 1940
Harper, (Private) A.J.	12 August 1943
Harper, Anthony	August 1943
Harpin, Hildred	16 December 1939
Harris, (Mr.) A.E.	1 March 1941
	7 August 1941
Harris, Paul	4 October 1940
Harris, Richard T.	17 June 1942
Harrison, N.H.	29 January 1941
Harrison, (Mr.) W.T.	May 1944
Harwood, John H.	9 May 1944
Haslam, George	September 1943
Haswell Miller, (Capt.) A.E.	16 March 1940
	21 October 1941
Haswell Miller, Josephine	8 October 1941
Hatts, (Cpl.) Kenneth H.	9 April 1942
	July 1942
	27 September 1942
	6 June 1945
Hauff, Kenneth	December 1939
Hawes, Meredith W.	October 1942
Hawkes, (Capt.) C.C.	14 July 1942
Hawkins, Irene	23 January 1941
Hawkins, (W/O) William G.	28 February 1945
Hay-Walker, Nadine	26 February 1942
	27 February 1945
Hayes, Joseph	16 December 1939
Haynes, (Miss) F.E.	4 March 1942
Heanly, Mildred H.	31 December 1940
Hearn, (Mr.) A.V.	21 March 1940
Heath, Dudley	19 December 1939
Heath, (Miss) Isobel	November 1943
	March 1944
	11 April 1944
	30 September 194_
	6 February 1945
	9 June 1945
Hefferman, (Miss) K.A.	10 April 1942
	21 May 1942
Henderson, (Mr.) A.E.	17 December 1939
	18 January 1940
	26 March 1940
	October 1941
Hennessey, Kevin J.	1 January 1940
Henty-Greer, (Miss)	May 1941
Hentycreeer (Henty Creer), (Miss) Deidre	November 1942
Hervey, K.J.	18 December 1939
Hey, Percy	7 September 1940
Hick, Allanson	18 December 1939

Higgs, F.C.	13 September 1940
Higham, Bernard	February 1943
Highman, (Lieut.) W.	16 December 1939
Hiley, (Miss) Muriel	19 July 1940
Hill, (Sub-Lieut.) A.S.B.	September 1943
Hill, Adrian	21 December 1945
	17 December 1939
	14 August 1940
	March 1941
	16 June 1941
Hill, (Miss) Diana Murray	27 November 1943
Hill, Lawrence G.	19 January 1944
Hill, (Flying Officer) P.M.C.	25 June 1942
	17 August 1942
Hill, (Private) R.W.	17 June 1942
Hill, Rowland H.	16 December 1939
Hinshelwood, J.	24 November 1945
Hislop, Healey	2 November 1945
Hitchcock, (Private)	November 1944
Hoar, (Mr.) H.F.	8 October 1940
Hodge, Jessie M.M.	20 December 1939
Hodgkinson, (A.C.2) Frank	3 October 1941
	January 1942
Hodson, (Mr.) R.E.W.	21 April 1942
Hodgson, (Mr.) J.(?)H.(?)	23 April 1940
Hofbauer, I.	June-July 1942
Hoffman, (Miss) Gwyneth Morgan	August 1944
Hofmann, Robert	17 December 1939
Holland, George H.B.	18 December 1939
	18 May 1943
Hollings, Arthur P.	29 September 1940
Holloway, Edgar	26 February 1940
	7 November 1940
	24 March 1942
Holloway, (Private) Ernest A.	20 January 1941
	February 1941
	20 August 1941
	September 1941
	January 1942
	8 February 1942
	25 April 1942
	9 May 1942
	13 July 1942
	30 October 1942
	December 1942
	25 September 1943
	26 November 1943
	March 1944
	31 August 1944
	5 December 1944
	20 March 1945
	10 June 1945

Holloway, (Mr.) R.  
Holt, Herbert  
Homer, (Mr.) G.E.  
Hooper, Fred G.  
Hooper, George W.

Hopper (Mr.)  
Hornbuckle (Able Seaman)  
Horner, Gordon E.  
Horsbrugh-Porter, (Lieut.) W.E.  
Hossack, (Mr.) J.W.  
Hostettler, John  
Houghton, (Private) L.

Houghton (Mr.)  
Houston, George  
Houthuesen, Albert  
Howard, (Mr.) M. Maitland  
Howell, (P/O) John  
Howes, Allan  
Howitz, (Mr.) E.

Hoy, Joseph  
Hoyland, Harry S.

Hoyle, (Private) W.  
Hubbard, Hesketh  
Hummel, (Surg. Lieut.) M.A.  
Hunt, Cecil A.  
Hunt, Reginald E.  
Huntley, Nancy

Hurry, Leslie  
Hurst, (Capt.) S.G.  
Huskinson, Thomas Leonard

16 June 1945  
20 June 1945  
25 June 1945  
28 June 1945  
29 June 1945  
4 July 1945  
6 July 1945  
19 July 1945  
7 August 1945  
11 August 1945  
18 August 1945  
September 1945  
April 1941  
14 December 1943  
December 1939  
16 December 1939  
26 March 1940  
March 1941  
July 1941  
June 1942  
March 1943  
January 194\_  
August 1943-  
December 1941  
December 1939  
27 August 1943  
15 December 1941  
19 December 1939  
30 October 1942  
November 1942  
May 1943  
28 September 1944  
18 December 1939  
30 July 1940  
20 August 1940  
12 June 1942  
24 December 1939  
May 1941  
25 August 1941  
5 May 1942  
10 May 1944  
September 1944  
21 November 1944  
28 December 1939  
25 January 1945  
12 May 1941  
20 January 1940  
30 October 1941  
28 April 1942  
February 1941  
August 1942  
6 February 1940

Hussey, (Mrs.) Brian	SEE: M. POLLOCK
Hutton, John	4 April 1940
	July 1943
Huxham, (Miss) Edith	8 January 1940
Huxtable, (Miss) Grace	23 November 1941
Ironside, Christopher	19 June 1941
Irwin, Greville	4 January 1940
Ivory, (Mr.)	15 February 1940
Jackson, Albert	20 December 1939
Jackson, (Mr.) C.	3 April 1941
Jackson, (Miss) J.	12 June 1944
Jackson, Jan(?; Jane?)	15 December 1939
Jackson, Marguerite	15 December 1939
Jagger, David	6 January 1940
James, (Mrs.) Bertha	November 1940
Jameson, Kenneth A.	6 December 1939
Jamieson, R. Kirkland	January 1941
	June 1941
Janes, (2nd Lieut.) Alfred G.A.	3 October 1941
Jebson (Jobson?), P.A.	2 January 1940
Jeffries, Ernest V.	15 December 1939
Jenkins, (Mrs.) Elizabeth Fuke	1 July 1942
Jennings, (Mrs.) Alix	15 March 1940
Jennis, (Mr.) G.	November 1940
Jepson, (Mrs.) P.	July 1943
Jessell, (Mr.) R.	October 1940
Jillard, (Miss) Hilda K.	March 1941
Johnson, (Mr.)	August 1943
Johnson, (Mr.) G.(?)	9 August 1943
Johnson, (Sub-Lieut.) Maurice	5 December 1943
Johnston, Angus	27 December 1941
Johnston, Donald R.	30 January 1940
	March 1940
Johnstone, Gwyneth	March 1944
Jones, Evan	19 December 1939
Jones, F.N. Collins	16 December 1939
Jones, Fred C.	7 March 1940
Jones, Harold	14 June 1942
Jones, Harold	18 December 1939
	26 August 1940
Jones, Harry E.	22 September 1941
Jones, (Capt.) I. Roberts	January 1943
	February 1943
Jones, (Miss) Jo	November 1941
	24 January 1942
Jones, Paul	24 February 1943
Jones, (Mr.) Petley	September 1941
Jones, Sydney	January 1941

Jonzen, Basil	19 December 1939
Joughlin, (Mr.) J.W.	January 1940
Jowsey, J. Wilson	n.d.
	30 March 1940
Kanelba, (Mr.) R.	8 January 1944
Keeling, C.	1941-1942
Keely, Patrick	February 1942
Keith, (Capt.) D.B.	4 October 1940
Kelly, (Mrs.) G.W.	SEE: M. FISHER
Kemmish, Patrick	16 May 1942
Kennedy, (Miss) C.M.	February 1941
Kenny, (Sgt.)	October 1945
Kent, (Mr.) Leslie	29 January 1945
Kermode, William	15 December 1939
Kerr, (Rfm.) A.E.	19 December 1939
Kerr, (Lieut.) D.D.H.	October 1945
Kidman, (Miss) Hilda E.	5 May 1941
Kidner, Lieut. E.M.	14 March 1942
Killip, Dan	25 January 1940
King, (Mr.)	27 October 1941
King, (Signalman) C.T.	28 March 1941
King, Frank(?)	31 October 1941
King, Herbert	3 January 1942
Kinnear, (Mr.) Leslie G.	January 1940
	5 July 1940
Kirby, (Mr.) S.A.	19 February 1940
Klatzow, (Mrs.) Dorrit	28 October 1941
Knowles, Horace J.	16 December 1939
	27 August 1941
	12 September 1941
Knowles, James M.	28 December 1943
Knowles, Reginald L.	15 December 1939
Knowles, (Miss) Vivian	February 1944
Koelz, (Private) F. Matthew	30 April 1944
Koop, (Miss) G.W.	November 1941
Korda, Vincent	18 February 1943
Kormis, F.J.	23 February 1940
	9 August 1940
	July 1941
Kourmoiaroff-Askew, (Mrs.) F.	21 March 1943
Kovacs, F.	28 December 1939
Kramer, Jacob	13 June 19412
Kregman, W.	16 December 1939
Lacey, J.	December 1939
	February 1941
	June 1943
	August 1943
Lach, (Mrs.) L.	1 September 1940



Lach-Szyrma, (Mr.) L.	21 April 1942
	June 1942
Lack, (Capt.) H.M.	20 June 1945
LaFontaine, Capt. T.S.	19 February 1940
	7 December 1943
	27 February 1944
Lagniez, (Mr.) R.	2 December 1941
Laidlaw, (Private) Ian	14 September 1941
	27 November 1941
	24 February 1941
	1941
Laird, (Mr.) A.R.	March 1945
Lamb, Lynton	17 December 1939
Lamb, Richard J.	21 February 1940
Lambart, Alfred	26 January 1942
Lambert, (Mrs.) F.M.	1 July 1943
Lambrick, (Mrs.) Dulcie	16 December 1939
Lamont, (Mrs.) Edie	March 1940
Lancaster, Edward P.	24 April 1940
	16 December 1939
Lander, Edgar	5 March 1941
Lane, James B.	22 March 1941
Lang, G. Ernest	May 1943
	7 September 1945
Langfield, (Mr.) A.	28 March 1942
Langmaid, (Lieut. Cmdr.) Rowland	14 November 1944
Lawes, (Mrs.) Llian	1 January 1940
Lawrenson, Joseph	January 1941
Lee, Sydney	16 December 1939
	18 December 1939
Leech, George W.	October 1944
Leeming, Wilfred	4 February 1942
Lees, (L.A.C.) Frank	2 December 1942
Le Feuvre, (L/Bdr.) John	19 December 1939
	19 December 1939
le Gallienne, (Miss) Gwen	18 December 1939
Leigh, Conrad	19 March 1940
Leigh, Rose Mira	19 October 1941
London, (Flight Lieut.) Warwick	June 1943
	11 November 1943
	February 1941
Lesnie, John H.	April 1941
	October 1944
Leszczynski, (Capt.) Michal	November 1944
	18 December 1939
Levy, Emmanuel	24 July 1941
	4 August 1941
	9 November 1940
Levy, (L./Cpl.) Mervyn Montague	25 February 1941
	8 March 1941
	2 October 1941
	15 March 1941
Lewis, (Miss) Aletta M.	

Lewis, (Mr.) L.C.	January 1942
Lewis, R.	April 1944
Liddell, Guy	18 March 1941
	6 August 1940
	25 April 1943
	September 1943
Lillford, M. Gordon	8 February 1945
Lindsay, (Sapper) Alan N.	14 October 1941
Lindsay, (Mr.) J.	7 January 1940
Lindsay Williams, (Miss) Margaret	14 June 1940
Lion, (Mrs.) Flora	August 1940
	April 1941
	June 1941
Lipscombe, Guy	July 1945
Liversidge, (Mr.) H.D.	28 February 1940
Loasby, (Mrs.) Ethel	23 February 1943
Lobley, (Mr.) J. Hodgson	21 December 1939
	September 1940
London, Eve	14 November 1940
Long, Brenda H.	26 September 1944
Long, C.B.	April 1941
Long, (Capt.) B.	April 1945
Longdon, (Capt.) M.G.	July 1943
Lousada, Anthony	August 1941
Love, (Gunner) A.F.	August 1942
Lovegrove, Arthur William	20 March 1940
Lovett, (Major) Nigel	19 April 194_
Low, David	3 March 194_
Lowe, Audren	4 February 1942
Lowe, Mabel	16 December 1939
Lowen, (Cpl.) F.	May 1942
Lowen, Fritz	27 February 1942
Lowenstein, (Princess)	7 December 1944
Lowenthal, (Miss) J.	August 1940
Loxton, (Mrs.) Barbara	December 1944
Lucas, S.	September 1942
Lunn, Augustus	27 April 1943
Lupton, (Mr.) L.F.	21 May 1941
Lyall, (Miss) Gill	14 March 1941
Lyle, Michael	29 June 1940
Lyne, (Capt.) T.	April 1945
Lyon, (Sapper) Ian	4 July 1942
	November 1942
Lyon, Kenneth	6 June 1944
McBryde, Robert	14 October 1940
McCall, Charles J.	December 1939
MacCann, George G.	February 1940
McCannell, (Miss) Ursula Vivian	11 August 1940
McColvin, N.	22 March 1941
McCormac, E.E.	31 December 1939

McIntosh, J.	3 April 1940
McKibbon (?; Mackibbin?), (Miss)	24 March 1942
McKie, (Miss) Helen	15 September 1940
	10 March 1941
	16 June 1942
McKnight, (Ordinary Seaman) R.H.	5 July 1944
McLacklin, Lawrence C.	16 December 1939
MacLean, (Miss) Margaret D.	25 June 1944
McLoughlin, (Gunner) D.	15 October 1942
McNeil, (Sapper)	3 January 1939
	3 June 1940
McPartlan (?; McParthan?), Maurice	31 July 1942
MacDonagh, Peter Wood	November 1940
Macdonald, Eric	22 December 1939
	16 February 1940
Macdougald, George D.	19 December 1939
Mace, John E.	22 December 1939
Macfadyen, (Miss) E.	July 1942
Mack, (Miss) M. Hamilton	21 March 1942
Mackenzie, A.	October 1941
MacKey (?; Macey?), Haydn	21 December 1939
MacKinlay, Miguel	December 1939
MacLeod, May	20 December 1939
	7 October 1940
Macmillan, (Mrs.) Ethel	22 November 1941
MacNeil, Alexander	16 December 1939
	7 June 1940
Main, Jean	19 July 1944
Mann, Ernest L.	13 October 1941
Mann, (Pilot Officer) W.	June 1943
Mann-Wade, John	16 December 1939
Manning, (Capt.) E.G.	15 March 1945
Marcus, (Mr.) O.	December 194
Marcuse, Rudolf	2 January 1940
Mardall, (Miss) Natalie	20 April 1940
Marks, Alexander	March 1942
Marlon-Lambert, David	25 February 1943
Marsden, Walter	19 July 1943
Marshall, Albert E.	24 April 1940
Marston, (Mr.) V.	February 1940
Martin, (Gunner) D.	15 October 1942
Martin, Edwin	18 December 1939
Martin, Kenneth	22 April 1940
Maskens, Charles W.	24 April 1945
Mason, Arnold	November 1941
Mason, Ursula	June 1942
Massey, (Mrs.) B.W.	November 1943
Mathews, (Mr.) R.G.	1 October 1940
	7 August 1941
Matousek, (Mr.) P.	August 1944
Matthews, Grace	6 May 1940
Maxwell, John	December 1939

May, F.S.	16 December 1939
	25 April 1940
	11 May 1940
Mayes, R.H.	1 February 1940
May, Robert W.	6 July 1942
Meade, (Mr.) J.M.	June 1942
Meadows, Bernard	January 1942
	October 1943
	December 1939
Meadows, Charles	24 December 1940
Meal, Walter	24 July 1941
Meeson, (Miss) Dora	15 September 1939
Megoran, Winston	16 December 1939
	28 May 1940
	August 1941
Meldrum, G.W.	26 March 1941
Melnikoff, Arram	13 July 1942
	5 September 1944
Meo, Innes	January 1941
Michaelis, (Mr.) C.M.	5 January 1940
Middleton, Horace	2 November 1940
	May 1943
Miles, J.C.	April 1940
Millais, (Capt.) H.R.	24 June 1944
Millard, P.F.	11(?) December 1939
Miller, (Private)	12 July 1945
Miller, Henry	5 July 1941
Miller, Owen	13 September 1940
Miller, R.R.	16 July 1943
Milligan, J. Waller	26 August 1940
Mills, A. Wallis	18 December 1939
Milman, (Private) C.	7 February 1945
Mingay, (Miss) L.M.	6 December 1943
Mitchell, Roy	14 April 1943
Molloy, Alec J.	16 December 1939
Monk, Keith V.	12 November 1943
Monkhouse, Victoria	2 December 1940
Montefiore, Cynthia	2 June 1942
Moon, (L.A.C.) Tennant	16 December 1943
Moore, (Lieut.) H.G.	18 January 1940
Moore, Percival	29 August 194
Moore, W. Stanley	17 January 1944
Morden, W.	16 December 1939
Morgan, L.	19 August 1941
Morgan, P.H.	28 April 1943
Morgan, Robert	4 October 1941
	1 April 1942
Moring, R.	28 July 1942
	18 August 1942
Morrison, (Capt.) G.R.	24 April 1945
Morrison, R. Boyd	June 1943
	December 1943

(fiancee of J.M. Morry [sic?])	6 October 1943
Morse-Brown, Sidney	August 1941
	15 October 1943
Mortelmans, (L/Cpl.) Edward	September 1941
	September 1942
Morton, Cavendish	2 January 1940
Morton, Concord	2 January 1940
Morton, (Mr.) H.	7 December 1943
Morton, (Mrs.) Lliane	1 July 1941
Morton, Ronald	September 1943
Morwiasky	September 1940
Moss, (Miss) Kathleen	October 1943
Moss, (Mr.) S. Dennant	August 1943
	September 1943
Mott, George Henry	December 1939
	20 March 1942
	July 1942
Moynes, W.	February 1944
	May 1945
Muir, (Mrs.) Agnes	January 1943
Muncaster, Claude	October 1944
Murphy, Diana	19 November 1940
Murray, William Miller	8 August 1941
	19 May 1942
Muskett, (Miss) W.	29 December 1939
	March 1943
Nash, (Miss) A.A.	18 December 1939
Nawiaskey, (Mrs.) Mechtilda	10 September 1940
Neal, James	25 August 1941
	27 December 1942
	July 1943
Neatby, Edward	April 1941
	18 December 1944
	14 January 194_
Nechamkin, (Miss)	September 1941
Neilson, G.E.	21 September 1944
Nelson, A.E.D.	16 December 1939
Nesbit, G. Wilson	1 February 1940
Nessler, (Private) Walter Hout	May 1941
	February 1942
	April 1942
	November 1942
	July 1944
	June 1945
Neuschul, Ernest	17 April 1941
Newland, (Miss) Anne	25 September 1944
	November 1944
Newman, Adeline	25 July 1942
Newton, John	3 November 1944
Nicholl, Gordon	3 December 1939

Nicholl, (Miss)	January 1940
Nicholls, (Mr.) A.B.	September 1945
Nicholls, (Lieut.) D.A.	March 1944
Nicholson, Ben	12 November 1943
Nicholson, (Private) Robert	20 December 1939
Nicholson, Robert	20 December 1939
Nicholson, (Sir) William	12 September 1941
Ninnes, Bernard	18 December 1939
Nisbet, Scott	21 December 1939
	16 December 1940
Noar, (Miss) Eva	17 December 1939
Nonnermacher, Hermann	21 July 1942
Noon, Gladys	25 November 1942
Norman, (Aircraftman) P.E.	24 June 1941
North, (Mr.) C.	17 December 1939
Nutt, (Mr.) C.	17 December 1939

Oakley, H.L.	April 1942
Oates, Cyril H.	16 May 1941
O'Connor, (Lieut. Cmdr.) E.D.	March 1942
O'Connor, (Mrs.) J.A.	27 May 1942
O'Donnell, H.C.	27 April 1942
Ogilvie, W.A.	December 1942
Ohly, (Mr.) W.	February 1941
Oliver, (Mr.) A.	September 1941
Olsson [?], H.P.	16 January 1941
Olsson, Julius	January 1940
Oppenheimer, Joseph	May 1942
Orme, Osmond	28 January 1940
Ore, Walter R.	29 February 1940
Orr, J.R. Wallace	January 1942
Oskotsky, Bernard	27 June 1941
	November 1941
Ososki, Louis	15 December 1939
Ostrick, B.	28 December 1939
Oules, (Miss) Catherine	27 July 1940
Ovey, Margaret	5 May 1943
	September 1943
Owen, Will	17 July 1940
Owens, (Mr.)	16 March 1943

Pace, Betty M.	18 December 1939
Page, (Signalman) Albert Schiller	March 1942
	March 1943
Page, Alfred	25 January 1941
Page, Ernest G.	27 September 1940
Paget, T.H.	November 1944
Paine, Charles	29 November 1940
	15 January 1941
	7 May 1941

Palmer, A.F.	8 September 1941
	September 1940
Palmer, (Miss) Susan	November 1940
	January 1940
	October 1940
Parker, (Flying Officer) I.F.B.	4 January 1944
Parkyb, W.	May 1942
Parr, H.(?)	August 1940
Parr, Thomas	May 1942
Parry, (Cpl.) Alan B.	March 1945
Parry, James	March 1944
Parsons, (Mrs.) Ian	SEE: TREBBIE RITCHIE
Partos, J.E.	8 March 1940
Partridge, K.S.	July 1943
Partridge, M.R.	March 1942
Pasmore, Victor	June 1941
Passant, A.E.	18 December 1939
Paterson, (Cpl.) Jason	April 1943
Patrick, (Mr.) J. McIntosh	28 December 1939
Pattison, E.L.	30 May 1940
Payton, R.B.	16 February 1943
Pearce, (Mrs.) Fay	16 July 1940
	April 1942
Pearce, Robin	April 1942(?)
Pearcey, Eileen	March 1945
Pears, Agnes M.	7 April 1945
Pearsall, Phyllis	February 1940
	16 July 1940(?)
	November 1940
	22 February 1941
	April 1942(?)
	28 May 1945
	September 1945
Pearson, C.J.	January 1943
	February 1943
Peddie, Archie	21 January 1942
Peile, (Miss) Misome(?)	21 April 1944
	January 1945
Pennett, Nora	1 September 1941
Penny, W. Neville	17 December 1939
Perceval, (Mr.) L.J.	April 1940
Percival, Charles	2 July 1941
Peri, Ladislav	24 September 1941
	22 March 1942
	6 July 1942
	30 August 1942
	May 1945
Perry, Heather	22 December 1939
Perry, J.W.	24 February 1940
Peyman, (Miss) J. Esdaile	21 July 1940
	20 September 1942
Philpot, (Mr.)	n.d.

Pierce, C.J.	November 1941
Pierce, William Glynn	September 1942
Pike, Joseph C.	7 May 1941
	October 1942
Pike, (Mrs.) Olive Snell	SEE: OLIVE SNELL
Pile, Albert T.	June 1942
Pilling, Peggy	22 April 1941
Pimlott, John	28 April 1941
Pinney, (Mrs.) Betty	7 November 1940
Pippet, Gabriel	2 March 1940
Pitcher, N. Sotheby	4 July 1940
	20 May 1942
	4 April 1943
	12 September 1943
Pitt, Edgar W.	3 February 1942
Plachte, (Miss) E.	September 1941
Plant, John J.	18 December 1939
Plate, (Lieut.) M.W.	21 April 1944
Platt, Joyce	May 1944
Platt, Russell	June 1945
Plessis, H.E. du	June 1945
Pleydell-Bouverie, (Mr.) C.	July 1944
	17 January 1945
Pollard, Henry	23 June 1941
Pollock, (Mr.) J.M.	7 June 1943
	July 1944
Pollock, (Miss) Mauricle	26 October 1941
	14 June 1942
	19 August 1942
	21 October 1942
Pomerance, (Mrs.) Fay	10 April 1940
Poole, (Aircraftman) W.G.	18 June 1941
	28 May 1942
	23 January 1943
	18 March 1943
	11 October 1944
Porter, (2nd Lieut.) Roy F.	23 February 1942
Potter, Frank	11 June 1940
	January 1941
	February 1941
	6 May 1941
Potter, (Miss) M.A.	August 1941
Poulter, Richard A.	13 February 1940
Power, James B.	18 December 1939
	2 April 1942
Power, (Cpl.) R.J.	7 September 1942
Poyser, T.	July 1940
Prater, Ernest	22 June 1940
	19 August 1940
	7 November 1942
Prichard, A.R.	June 1943
Primmer, (Miss) K.	August 1940
Pulham, Peter Roger	



Puttick, (Private) H.	23 March 1940
	9 March 1942
Pym, Rowland	7 July 1941
Radford, P.J.	4 February 1942
Raeburn-Dobson, (A.C.2)	3 March 1943
Rainey, F. Tristram	12 December 1939
	30 December 1939
	3 January 1940
	March 1940
Ramsay, D.	11 June 1942
Ramsay, Owen	June 1941
	July 1941
Ramsey, Wilfred	26 July 1941
Rathmell, T.R.	29 July 1940
Rapaport, (Miss) Joan	3 December 1942
Rawlings, (Mr.) L.O.	24 May 1940
	October 1945
Ray, F.W.T.	10 January 1940
Rayner, Henry	1 September 1943
	7 June 1944
Read, (Miss) E. Winning	August 1940
Read Davis, (Mr.) P.	6 April 1940
Rean, W.H.	17 December 1941
	16 January 1944
Redgrave, W.	July 1943
	February 1945
Redmill, H.	21 April 1941
	5 June 1941
Reed, Gladys	n.d.
Rees, Gwyn Roger	19 December 1939
Reeve, (Mr.?)	July 1941
Reeve, Russell	2 December 1940
	24 June 1941
Reid, Andrew	17 December 1939
Reid, (Miss) Nano	February 1942
Reitlinger, Gerald	18 October 1940
Remy, W.A.	18 June 1941
Rendell, D.F. Percy	8 August 1941
Rey, (Mr.)	6 February 1943
Rhodes, (Mrs.) F.N.	23 April 1942
Rhodes, W.	16 March 1943
Ribbons, Harold	September 1942
Rice, Bernard	19 December 1939
Richmond, Gordon	August 1941
Richmond, Peter G.L.	17 July 1943
	27 September 1943
Ridgway, (Flight Lieut.) R.	26 June 1941
Rignall, J.(?; N.?; W.?) A.	20 February 1945
Rimmer, John	15 December 1939
	July 1942

Ritchie, (Miss) Trebbie(?)	29 June 1943
Rivers-Moore, (Miss) Marion E.	January 1940
Robbins, Stanley G.	2 May 1940
Robbins, T.E.	December 1939
Robert, Alfred	July 1941
Roberts, A.B. Llewelyn	October 1941
Roberts, (Miss) R.	18 December 1939
Roberts, R. Denis	January 1942
Robinson, D.M.	August 1943
Robinson, (Miss) Ione	August 1942
Robinson, Julius	September 1941
Robinson, Stuart P.	10 November 1942
	February 1942
	April 1942
	May 1942 (2)
	June 1942
	September 1942
	November 1942
	23 November 1943
	18 June 1944
	July 1944
Robinson, W. Howard	1 August 1940
Robinson, Wyndham	October 1944
Rock, (Mr.)	16 February 1944
Rodger, Hamish G.	8 February 1944
Roe, Fred	4 May 1944
Roebuck, Julian	20 July 1942
Rogers, C.F.G.	6 January 1940
Rogers, G. Cedric H.	October 1942
Rogers, John Edward	18 December 1939
Rogers, Stanley	June 1943
Rolt, David	18 November 1940
	March 1942
	July 1942 (2)
	October 1942
	March 1943
Rorke, (Miss) Lily	22 January 1940
Rose, (Sir) Francis	17 December 1939
	August 1943
	8 February 1944
Ross, Michael C.	11 June 1942
	August 1944
Ross-Thomas, A.	February 1943
Rowan, H. Louis	26 December 1939
Rowe, C.H.	21 April 1941
	October 1943
	26 April 1944
Rowles, S.C.	17 December 1939
	1 April 1940
Royle, Herbert	20 December 1939
Rudall, P.C.	6 December 1943
Rumbold, Gilbert	April 1944

Runacres, (Mr.)	May 1940
Russell, Gyrth	May 1941
	October 1941
Rust, L.D.	August 1940
Rutherford, (Lieut.) James	14 December 1943
Rutherford, (Miss) Rosemary E.	9 February 1941
	May 1941
	November 1942
	January 1943
	13 January 1944
	June 1944
	October 1944
	11 August 1944
Ryall, (Miss) Beatrice	
Salaman, Michael	9 December 1939
	4 January 1941
Salisbury, Frank O.	30 April 1945
Salmon, (Mrs.) D.	March 1945
Sampson, (Sgt.) A.	18 April 1945
Sanderson, (Mr.) H., Jr.	19 December 1939
Sandlands, (Miss) Gillian	2 December 1940
Sargent, F.W.	9 June 1944
Saunders, Roy	January 1942
	18 February 1942
	October 1942
Savage, (Sgt.) W.	16 April 1943
Savory, (Major) A.L.C.	July 1945
Sayer, (Gunner) D.	October 1940
	March 1941
Scaramanga, (Miss) Ursula	October 1943
Scarfe, Lwrence	19 March 1941
Schames, S.	28 April 1941
	July 1941
	22 September 1942
Schleimer, H.	16 March 1941
Schluger, (Mr.)	15 December 1939
Scott, (A/C. 2)	November 1941
Scott, Angus	December 1942
	March 1943
Scott, (Private) Gordon N.	24 March 1943
	1 February 1944
Scott, (Lady) George	SEE: MOLLY BISHOP
Scott, (Private) William	9 October 1942
	24 March 1943
Scott-Snell, Edward	16 February 1940
Seabrooke, Elliott	21 June 1941
	October 1941
	18 June 1941
Seaby, Allen W.	30 August 1941
Scrimgeour, Adela V.	10 November 1941
	14 October 1945

Seager, S.D.R.	May 1942
	June 1942
Sealy, Colin	October 1945
	1 January 1940
Searle, Ronald	February 1943
	31 January 1941
	March 1941
	14 June 1941
	19 July 1941
	15 November 1941
	21 November 1945
Sefton, (Mrs.) Anne	20 June 1941
Self, Frank	6 April 1941
	4 August 1941
	April 1944
Segal, Hyman	26 October 1944
Severn, June	3 December 1945
Shackleton, Keith	25 February 1944
	January 1945
	July 1945
Sharp, Miles W.B.	27 January 1942
	12 April 1943
	26 January 1944
	30 August 1944
	20 November 1944
	4 February 1942
	20 January 1941
	October 1942
	July 1941
	29 December 1939
	June 1940
	November 1943
	SEE: NANCY HUNTLEY
	13 March 1940
	6 May 1943
	27 March 1940
	22 May 1941
	January 1944
	8 January 1941
	23 December 1939
	7 September 1940
	22 May 1941
	17 November 1941
	30 December 1939
	7 February 1940
	10 October 1940
	5 April 1945
	10 December 1939
	27 October 1940
	March 1942
	November 1943
	June 1943
Sibley, Kenneth M.	
Silas, Ellis	
Simeon, Eunice	
Simmons, (Mr.) Th. C. Eynes	
Simpson, Charles	
Sinclair, (Mrs.) Beryl M.	
Singleton, Wilfrid J.	

Skelton, (Miss) Edith F.	11 June 1944
Slade, L.J.C.	19 February 1941
Slater, Frank	12 November 1940
Slonimska-Konarska, (Mrs.)	March 1942
Smart, (Mr.) Borlase	14 October 1939
	14 December 1940
Smart, (Mr.) D.I.	20 December 1939
Smart, (Mr.) E. Hodgson	31 December 1939
Smee, (Miss) Sylvia	25 February 1940
	8 August 1941
Smith, (Mr.)	May 1941
Smith, Alan	16 December 1939
Smith, Edwin	June 1942
Smith, Erik J.	9 February 1944
Smith, (Mr.) F.G.	18 June 1940
Smith, F.W.H.	December 1945
Smith, Graham	17 December 1939
Smith, Henry	28 February 1942
Smith, Howard	11 August 1941
	6 August 1942
	25 October 1944
Smith, J. Ranswell	4 June 1942
Smith, J.W.	June 1945
Smith, James F.S.	24 August 1944
Smith, L.	26 October 1943
Smith, Leonard J.	14 December 1941
Smith, Percy J.	16 December 1939
	26 March 1941
Smith, Sidney	October 194_
Smith, Stephen	18 December 1939
Smith, (Miss) U.	January 1944
Smithson, R.T.	19 January 1940
Snell, (Miss) Olive	4 December 1940
	July 1941
	December 1941
	June 1942
	November 1942
	1 July 1943
	September 1943
	March 1944
Snowman, Kenneth	20 February 1941
	April 1945
Sochachewsky, Maurice	6 October 1939
	22 May 1940
	10 June 1944
	February 1945
	March 1942
	August 1941
Soll, (Mr.) C.I.	17 December 1939
Somerfield, (Mr.) D.H.	23 November 1944
Somerville, Edward	March 1941
Sonnis, (Mr.) A.	September 194_
Sozonov, (Mr.) V.	

Sparrov, (Miss) Clodagh	7 June 1943
Spence, John G.	2 January 1940
Spencer, (Mrs.) Hilda Carline	25 April 1940
Spier, David	16 July 1940
Spike, W.O.	1 September 1941
Sproule, (Miss) Sara	June 1943
Stanton, Rebel	31 July 1941
	20 November 1939
	30 December 1939
	19 August 1941
	May 1942
Stapleton, Alan	30 June 1941
Starling, (Mrs.) J.	1 July 1943
Starmer, Walter P.	15 December 1939
	2 March 1940
	27 November 1940
	2 June 1941
Steegman, Philip	August 1940
	January 1941
	April 1942
	July 1943
Steel, Kenneth	16 December 1939
	9 August 1940
Stemp, Eric	July 1944
Stephens, (Mr.) E.W.	26 February 1944
Stephenson, Gilbert M.	26 May 1942
Stephenson, Philippa A.F.	1939
Stevens, F. John L.	16 February 1942
Stevens, (Mr.) G.A.	January 1940
Stevenson, George V.	January 1943
Stevenson, Patric [sic]	17 December 1939
Stewart, Allan	28 December 1939
Stewart, (Mr.) W.A.	June 1945
Sthyr, Eric H.	May 1942
	27 November 1942
Stiebel, (Miss) Helen	15 May 1941
Stiles, (Miss) Sybella	26 December 1939
Stirling, Gordon	19 December 1939
Stirling, Robert J.	1 February 1940
Stokes, Denny C.	10 February 1940
Stone, (Flying Officer) C.A.C.	February 1940
Stone Pearn, Norman E.	9 September 1940
Stonor, (Miss) Jessica	March 1944
Strachey, John	15 July 1940
Street, (Mrs.)	November 1942
Stringer, John Michael	29 September 1943
Stroudley, (Mr.) L.J.	13 January 1940
	3 January 1942
Stuart, Ian	17 December 1939
Stuart-Hill, A.	19 January 1942
	24 July 1943
Stugrimm(?), Gale(?)	August 1940

Suddaby, Rowland	11 July 1940
	7 March 1941
	29 August 1941
Sugden, Alan	2 April 1942
Sugden, J.K.	18 May 1942
	27 October 1942
Surrey Dane, (A.C.W.2) (Miss)	January 1942
Sutton, Fran	December 1943
Sutton, H.M.	6 January 1940
	28 February 1941
	24 April 1941
Swaine, F.(?) A.	8 June 1941
	9 July 1941
	11 August 1941
	12 November 1941
	28 November 1941
	11 May 1943
	9 September 1943
	3 November 1944
Swainson, Douglas	3 December 1941
Swan, Donald S.	8 October 1943
Swan, Robert	17 December 1939
	27 December 1940
	24 June 1941
	26 December 1941
	5 October 1942
	16 September 1943
	October 1943
	17 March 1945
Swinson, Edward S.	13 March 1941
Swiny, (Cpl.) C.W.	4 August 1943
	September 1943
	26 July 1944
	19 September 1944
	3 April 1945
	April 1945
Sykes, Steven B.	4 January 1940
Sykes-Kettlewell, Tom	10 April 1945
Symon-Moss, (Mr.)	
Tafani, E.L.	1 January 1940
Tanner, (Mr.)	November 1942
Tayler, (Mrs.)	October 1940
Taylor, (Mr.) A.C.	4 April 1944
	5 November 1944
Taylor, David	18 December 1939
Taylor, Helen E.	14 August 1941
Taylor, Willison	8 November 1943
Templeman, (Mrs.) C.	June 1941
Templeton, Arthur J.	27 December 1939
	20 March 1940
Tennant, Trevor	21 July 1943

Tennant, (Mrs.) Trevor	24 December 1942
Theodore, Frank	November 1941
Thesiger, Ernest	March 1941
Thomas, B.D.L.	June 1943
Thomas, (Mr.) D.W.	February 1944
Thomas, Lang	September 1941
Thomas, (Miss) M.	November 1944
Thomas, Walter	16 December 1939
Thompson, Robert	January 1942
	20 April 1942
Thring, Marion	20 January 1941
Thrupp, (Miss) Daisy M.	4 January 1940
	10 February 1940
	September 1941
	31 October 1941
Tilden, Philip	10 February 1940
Tinker, David	26 September 1943
	5 October 1943
Tirr, (Cpl.) W.	October 1944
Todd, Ronald C.	16 December 1939
Tooby, M.	September 1945
Torrie, John J. Fleming	28 November 1939
Towner, Donald	16 December 1939
	August 1940
	5 August 1941
Trent, Newbury A.	18 January 1940
Tribe, (Miss) Barbara	16 June 1941
	August 1945
Trist, Beryl	17 October 1941
	May 1943
	9 November 1943
Tucker, (Mr.) W.J.	29 May 1942
	January 1943
Tufnell, H.J.	5 June 1942
Tuite, Raymond	19 December 1939
Tunncliffe, C.F.	1 August 1940
Turner, Arthur	December 1939
Turner, B.S.	28 July 1944
	4 August 1944
Turner, B. Ward	December 1944
Turner, (Capt.) C.E.	16 December 1939
Turton, Cecil	25 January 1942
Tuttlebee, G.	October 1942
Tutton, (Mr.)	December 1945
Twaits, H.E.	14 June 1941
	23 July 1941
	October 1941
	May 1942
Tyson, (Miss) Kathleen	7 May 1940
Underwood, Leon	10 November 1942



Unite, (Mrs.) Daphne	11 February 1944
Unwin, (Miss) Beryl	17 June(?) 1944
Urquhart, Alexander	June 1944
	February 1942
	7 January 1940
Vale, Reynolds	15 December 1939
Vale, (Mrs.) Ruth	5 February 1944
Vale, W.T.	6 February 1942
Van Anrooy, A.	June 1944
Van den Steen de Jehay, (Comte) Guy	October 1944
Vanderlyn, N.	19 August 1941
van der Veen, C.W.	18 December 1939
Van Dusen, Howard	May 1941
Van Genechten, J.B.	14 June 1940
van Linden (Lieut. Baron)	November 1943
Vasey, Teresa P.	15 December 1939
Vaughan-Wicks, David	4 April 1943
Venton, W.B.	20 December 1939
Verrall, Hugh	2 November 1939
	May 1940
Vickers, John	16 December 1939
Vincze, (Mr.)	12 January 1941
Waddington, (Miss) Vera	17 July 1944
	14 November 1944
Wadsworth, Edward	3 April 1941
Wakeford, Edward F.	15 December 1939
	August 1945
Waldron, M.J.	March 1940
Walker, (Mr.)	December 1942
Walker, Alexander	12 February 1944
Walker, Edward	December 1939
	17 March 1940
	April 1941
Walker, Meyerscough	December 1940
Wallace, Robin	4 January 1940
Wallis, Nevil A.E.	27 May 1943
Walsh, (Miss) Maureen	10 November 1942
Walters, Evan	3 September 1941
Walton, Allan	22 March 1942
	August 1942
Ward, Grace	November 1945
Ward, (Capt.) Louis	8 November 1943
Wardle, Bernard	2 January 1940
Warlow, (Lieut.) H. Picton	January 1942
	February 1945
Watelet, A.	18 December 1939
Watherston, Marjorie	October 1943
Watson, (Mrs.) Barbara	April 1943

Watson, Bernard	February 1945
Watson, Elizabeth	30 June 1941
Watson, Henry E.	17 December 1939
Watson, (Cpl.) J.R.	12 December 1944
Watson, Leslie J.	7 January 1940
Watson, Montagu	16 December 1939
Watton, (Lieut.) John Fessenden	23 August 1943
	July 1945
Weare, Tony	7 April 1940
Weatherby, R.C.	7 November 1940
Webb, Joseph	8 April 1943
Webby, S.	10 July 1942
Webster, Norman	May 1944
Wedgwood, Geoffrey	29 December 1939
Weill, Pavel	5 August 1942
	3 May 1943
Weissenborn, (Mr.) H.	2 February 1941
	May 1941
Wells, (Miss) Barbara	5 January 1944
Wells, Denys G.	5 January 1940
West, Waldron	29 December 1939
	26 July 1940
	19 November 1940
	March 1941
Weston, John	July 1941
Westwater, R.H.	22 December 1939
Westwood, C.J.	July 1941
Whatley, Ernest	24 October 1944
Wheat, John William	16 December 1939
Wheeler, Geoffrey	16 May 1941
Wheeler, (Miss) Marjorie	16 December 1939
	30 October 1940
	18 December 1940
	January 1941
	January 1943
	29 January 1944
	27 May 1944
Whicker, F.	27 December 1943
Whistler, Hector	February 1944
White, Brian	27 March 1941
White Clarence	31 December 1939
White, Paul F.	December 1939
	5 March 1940
Whitehead Smith, (L/Cpl.) S.	22 November 1942
Whiting, Frederic	20 March 1941
Whittington, Marjorie	1 January 1940
	25 August 1941
Whytehead, Rachel	27 September 1943
Wicks, D.V.	October 1944
Widmer, John W.J.R.	9 March 1944
Wilcox, (Mr.)	February 1943
Wilkie, James	26 December 1939

Wilkinson, Robert Wilmot	October 1941
Williams, (Mrs.) Anne	January 1942
Williams, Arthur E.	15 June 1941
Williams, (Mr.) F.S.	15 March 1945
Williams, G.J.	June 1944
Williams, Ivor	14 April 1944
	28 January 1943
	10 November 1941
	22 February 1942
	10 November 1942
	September 1943
	31 January 1944
	4 March 1944
	26 October 1944
	July 1945
Williams (Lieut.) James E.	July 1944
	22 September 1944
Williams, M. Meredith	27 December 1939
Williamson, Harold	8 January 1944
	3 May 1944
	15 December 1945
Willis, Charles	April 1943
Willis, Rosamund	10 February 1941
Wilson, David	15 February 1945
Wilson, Mervyn(?; Melvyn?)	January 1941
Wilson, Peter	5 February 1940
Wilson, Peter R.	13 November 1940
	6 May 1941
Wilson, Stanley	27 December 1939
	June 1941
	15 September 1942
	October 1942
	November 1943
Wilson, William W.	18 December 1939
Wimble, Maurice A.	1 January 1940
Winter, A.C.	12 January 1940
Withrop, J. Coburn	29 December 1939
Wolfe, Edward	15 October 1940
	March 1945
Wolfe, Edward	12 June 1940
	November 1940
	October 1944(?)
Wolfe, (Mrs.) Humbert	9 July 1940
? Wolman) Alfred A.	18 December 1939
Wood, N.	16 December 1939
Wood, (Sapper) W.K.	May 1941
Wood, William T.	30 May 1940
Woodburn, Clarence	24 January 1941
	February 1945
Woodford, James	1 July 1941
	22 April 1944
Woods, H.E.	19 December 1939

Wooldridge, Herbert George	July 1941
Woolland, (Miss) Dorothy E.	December 1939
Woollatt, L.H.	18 January 1941
	8 July 1942
Workman, Harold	18 October 1940
Wragg, Arthur	22 December 1939
	5 April 1941
Wright, (Miss) Colette M.	24 February 1940
Wright, Edward	September 1942
Wyendenbruck, (Countess) Nora	23 February 1941
Wyeth, Paul	1 July 1941
	September 1943
Wyke, E.L.	April 1945
Wyllie, (Wing Cmdr.) Harold	December 1939
Ximenes, Elio	January 1940
	6 February 1941
Yates, Peter	9 May 1944
Young, Beric	April 1945
Young, Edgar	15 December 1939
Young, R.H.	May 1942
Ziegler, Archibald	8 July 1940
	March 1943
Zsoter, (Mr.) Akos De	25 August 1941
	September 1941
	October 1941
Zyw, Alexander	31 August 1942

Appendix 1: Part 6Other Artists Considered for Employment:

- 1) Recommended to the MoL by Kenneth Clark, Muirhead Bone, Percy Jowett and Walter Russell, September 1939:

## Recommended for employment:

John Aldridge	Wyndham Lewis
John Armstrong	Robert Medley
Edward Ardizzone	Cedric Morris
Edward Bawden	John Nash
George Belcher	Paul Nash
David Bomberg	C.R.W. Nevinson
Muirhead Bone	William Nicholson
Stephen Bone	Charles Pears
William Coldstream	John Piper
Philip Connard	R.V. Pitchforth
Charles Cundall	Eric Ravilious
Francis Dodd	William Roberts
Barnett Freedman	William Rothenstein
Clive Gardiner	Henry Rushbury
John Gardiner	Gilbert Spencer
Duncan Grant	Stanley Spencer
David Jones	Graham Sutherland
E. McKnight Kauffer	A.R. Thomson
Eric Kennington	Edward Wadsworth
Laura Knight	Norman Wilkinson
Henry Lamb	H.S. Williamson
Morland Lewis	

## Recommended to be placed on a reserve list:

H.D. du Plessis	James Fitton
Claude Rogers	Mrs. Dodd Proctor
Victor Pasmore	Vanessa Bell
A.C. Overton	Eve Kirk

2) Artists recommended for employment, by the WAAC, as of 28 February 1940 (source: GP/72/B, pp.34-51).

(R) indicates an artist placed on the Reserve List.

\* indicates a Scottish artist recommended to the WAAC in January 1940.

Artists whose work was acquired by the WAAC:<sup>4</sup>

Mary Adshead (R)	W. Russell Flint (R)
Adrian Allinson (R)	Meredith Frampton (R)
Leonard Appelbee (R)	Barnett Freedman
Edward Ardizzone	Hubert Freeth
John Armstrong (R)	Ethel Gabain (R)
Robert Austin	Charles Ginner
James Bateman (R)	Duncan Grant
Edward Bawden	James Grant
Walter Bayes (R)	Anthony Gross
Oswald Birley (R)	James Gunn
George Bissill (R)	Robin Guthrie (R)
David Bomberg (R)	Alan Gwynne-Jones (R)
Stephen Bone	A.S. Hartrick
Rodney Burn (R)	Keith Henderson*
Thomas Carr (R)	Thomas Hennell (R)
William Clause (R)	Blair Hughes-Stanton
Dorothy Coke (R)	F. Ernest Jackson
William Coldstream	Norman Janes (R)
Philip Connard	Edmond Kapp
Raymond Cown (R)	Eric Kennington
James Cowie (R)*	Eve Kirk
Raymond Coxon	Laura Knight
H.A. Crawford*	Henry Lamb
Charles Cundall	Wyndham Lewis
Robin Darwin (R)	Vincent Lines (R)
Anthony Devas	L.S. Lowry (R)
Frank Dobson	Frank H. Mason (R)
Francis Dodd	Raymond McGrath
William Dring (R)	Robert Medley
Paul Drury	Bernard Meninsky
T.C. Dugdale	Paul Methuen
Evelyn Dunbar	W.T. Monnington
Alan Durst	Henry Moore
Simon Elwes (R)	Harley Morley (R)
Jacob Epstein	Rodrigo Moynihan (R)
Richard Eurich (R)	John Nash
R.G. Eves	Paul Nash
John Farleigh	C.R.W. Nevinson

---

<sup>4</sup> Muirhead Bone was already employed as official war artist to the Admiralty when compilation of this list began.

G.W. Lennox Paterson (R)	Rupert Shephard (R)
Mervyn Peake	Robert Sivell*
Charles Pears	John Skeaping
John Piper	Alan Sorrell (R)
R.V. Pitchforth	Gilbert Spencer
Elizabeth Polunin (R)	Stanley Spencer
Eric Ravillious	Steven Spurrier (R)
William Roberts	Graham Sutherland
Claude Rogers	Eric W. Taylor (R)
William Rothenstein	A.R. Thomson
Kenneth Rowntree	A.R. Middleton Todd
Henry Rushbury	Carel Weight
Randolph Schwabe	John Wheatley (R)
Edward Seago (R)	Norman Wilkinson (R)
Richard Seddon (R)	H.S. Williamson (R)

Artists whose work was not acquired by the WAAC

Mrs. Noel Gilford Adeney (R)	
Anna Airy (R)	W.G. de Glehn (R)
Stanley Anderson	T. Derrick (R)
F.J. Archer (R)	W. Reid Dick
S.R. Badmin	J.A. Dodgson (R)
John Banting (R)	Edmund Dulac (R)
John Baynes (R)	R.O. Dunlop
Max Beerbohm	H.E. du Plessis (R)
Graham Bell (R)	Powys Evans (R)
Quentin Bell (R)	Hans Feibusch (R)
Elinor Bellingham Smith (R)	
Nadia Benois (R)	Hugh Finney (R)
Pearl Binder (R)	James Fitton (R)
S.J. Lamorna Birch (R)	Hanslip Fletcher (R)
Douglas Percy Bliss (R)	David Foggie (R)*
Frank Brangwyn	R. Garbe (R)
Phylliss Bray (R)	Colin Gill (R)
Arthur Briscoe (R)	Eric Gill
G.L. Brockhurst (R)	Stephen Gooden
Peter Brooker (R)	Dora Gordine (R)
R.G. Brundrit (R)	C.E. Grunspan (R)
Charles Bryant (R)	Arthur H. Hall (R)
Robert Buhler (R)	George Harcourt (R)
G.N. Burnand (R)	C.L. Hartwell (R)
Richard Carline (R)	A.R. Hayward (R)
Sidney Causer (R)	Gertrude Hermes
C.S. Cheston (R)	A. Stuart Hill (R)
Edna Clarke-Hall	Adrian Hill
A.E. Cooper (R)	Curwen E. Hodgkin (R)
John Cooper (R)	Frances Hodgkins
John Copley (R)	Edgar Allan Howes (R)
Adrian Daintrey	Leonard B. Huskinson (R)
Douglas Davidson (R)	David Jagger (R)

R. Kirkland Jamieson (R)	Victor Pasmore (R)
Augustus John	Maresco Pearce (R)
David Jones	Heather Perry (R)
Harold Jones	Victor Polunin (R)
John Kavanagh (R)	Frederick T. Porter (R)
Gerald Kelly	James Proudfoot*
Lady Kennet (R)	Hilda Quick (R)
Cecil King (R)	Gwen Raverat
L.J. Kinnear (R)	J.D. Revel (R)
J.K. Kirby (R)	Loris Rey
Clara Klinghoffer (R)	Bernard Rice (R)
Harold Knight (R)	Albert Rutherford
A.K. Lawrence	Eric Schilsky
Edward Le Bas (R)	Walter Richard Sickert
Gilbert Ledward	D.I. Smart (R)
Rupert Lee (R)	Howard Somerville (R)
S. Lee (R)	Stephen Spurrier (R)
Clare Leighton (R)	W.J. Steggles (R)
A. Neville Lewis	Geoffrey Tibbles
Morland Lewis (R)	Donald Towner (R)
David Low	Newbury A. Trent (R)
E.S. Lumsden*	Leon Underwood (R)
Robert Lyon (R)	Hugh Verrall (R)
Sine Mackinnon	Edward Wadsworth
Cathleen Mann	Ethel Walker
Arnold Mason	Robin Wallace (R)
Paul Maze (R)	Clifford Webb (R)
James McBey (R)	Geoffrey Wedgwood
C.J. McColl*	Rex Whistler (R)
A. McGlashan (R)*	Ethelbert White
Norman McNeil (R)	Franklin White (R)
W. McTaggart (R)*	Gabriel White (R)
P.F. Millard (R)	Frederick Whiting (R)
Gerald Moira (R)	William Wilson*
Cedric Morris (R)	W.T. Wood (R)
A.J. Munnings (R)	James A. Woodford
E. Newling (R)	Arthur Wragg (R)
Susan Palmer (R)	Richard Wyndham
Agnes Miller Parker	

Ulster artists recommended to the WAAC in 1940.

William Conor	G. MacCann
J. Hunter	C. Middleton
J. Luke	S. Morrison



Appendix 1: Part 7Viscount Esher's 1939 List of Artists**-Later made official war artists:**

Edward Bawden	John Piper
William Coldstream	Eric Ravilious
Rodrigo Moynihan	Graham Sutherland
Mervyn Peake	Carel Weight

**-Later given short-term contracts by the WAAC:**

Leonard Appelbee	Claude Rogers
Anthony Devas	Kenneth Rowntree
Robert Medley	

**-Later sold work to the WAAC:**

Julian Trevelyan

**-Had no dealings with the WAAC:**

John Aldridge  
 John Banting  
 Graham Bell  
 Lawrence Gowing  
 Lynton Lamb  
 Kenneth Martin  
 Victor Pasmore  
 Geoffrey Tibble

Appendix 1: Part 8Official War Artists' Representation in the Tate Gallery<sup>5</sup>**-Represented in the Tate collection before the War:**

Edward Ardizzone	Henry Lamb
Muirhead Bone	John Nash
Stephen Bone	Paul Nash
Charles Cundall	R.V. Pitchforth
R.G. Eves	John Platt
Eric Kennington	Charles Wheeler

**-First entered the Tate collection during the War:**

Edward Bawden	W.T. Monnington
William Coldstream	John Piper
Evelyn Dunbar	Eric Ravilious
Richard Eurich	Graham Sutherland
Barnett Freedman	A.R. Thomson
Thomas Hennell	

**-Not represented at the Tate collection at the end of the War:**

Henry Carr	Rodrigo Moynihan
Leslie Cole	Mervyn Peake
William Dring	Albert Richards
Anthony Gross	Leonard Rosoman
Bernard Hailstone	Rupert Shephard
Keith Henderson	Carel Weight
James Morris	John Worsley

---

<sup>5</sup> Tate Gallery, The Collections of the Tate Gallery: British Painting, Modern Painting and Sculpture (London: Tate Gallery, 1969).

## Appendix 2

### Attendance at WAAC Meetings

The War Artists' Advisory Committee held 197 meetings between 23 November 1939 and 29 December 1945. E.M.O'R. Dickey served as Secretary until August 1942, at which time his duties were assumed by Arnold Palmer. Palmer was replaced by G. Elmslie Owen the next month, and by E.C. Gregory beginning in July 1943. Of the artist-members of the Committee, Percy Jowett's attendance became sporadic following the evacuation of the RCA from London in 1940, and his place on the Committee was usually taken by Randolph Schwabe beginning in January 1941. Muirhead Bone attended meetings throughout the War on a regular basis, but the presence of Walter Russell was less reliable.

Colin Coote was replaced as the War Office representative by Selwyn Jepson in June 1945. E. Croft-Murray and Armide Oppé (both members of the Admiralty's Honours and Awards Section) substituted on occasion for R.M.Y. Gleadowe and, following the latter's death in 1944, the Admiralty was represented by Oliver Warner (also a member of the Honours and Awards Section). J.P. Hildred represented the Air Ministry until the spring of 1940. His place was taken by Harald Peake, who was in turn succeeded, at the beginning of 1942, by Lord Willoughby de Broke and A. Blackborow.

The spokesperson for the Ministry of Home Security, fol-

lowing the departure of T.B. Braund in January 1940, was the more active J.T.A. Burke, followed by M.W. Murdoch in May 1942 and by a Miss Crawter in February 1945. The Ministry of Supply first sent a delegate (W.D. Sturch) to the Committee in February 1940. Sturch was succeeded by R.T. Blackwood from October 1941 to May 1942, and by Geoffrey Burton from August to October 1942. In that year the MoS was incorporated within the Ministry of Production, which was represented by T.G. Bedwell from June to November, and by Geoffrey Burton thereafter. Fleetwood Pritchard became the first of two spokespersons for the Ministry of War Transport in January 1943, and was replaced by J. Rosswick in October 1944. The Ministry of Information also sent delegates to the WAAC, especially in 1939, 1940 and 1941.

Appendix 3  
Censored Pictures

This list includes all the pictures (no sculptures attracted the censors' attention) stopped for whatever reason. Some were barred from being exhibited or reproduced, while others could be put on exhibition but not reproduced. No complete list of censored works survives from the 1940's. This appendix has been compiled from what few lists survive and from an index card file produced by the WAAC. Insofar as it is available the following information is given for each picture: identification number and title, date on which it was stopped by the censors, date on which it was released, and its mode of acquisition by the WAAC. "Contract" indicates a picture for which a short-term contract was issued. Pictures produced by official war artists have no acquisition information given.

G. Adamson

LD 3853. U-Boat Hunters. 17 April 1944; June 1945; purchase.

E. Ardizzone

LD 867. Bomb Disposal. Probing for Tracks of a Bomb. 25 February 1941; n.d.

LD 868. Examining the Fuse of a Bomb (1). 25 February 1941; n.d.

LD 869. Bomb Disposal Squad. Probing for Tracks of a Bomb in Loose Earth. 25 February 1941; n.d.

- LD 870. Examining the Fuse of a Bomb (2). 25 February 1941, n.d.
- LD 2779. On the Road to Fuks (Loot). n.d.; n.d.
- LD 2938. On the Road to Tripoli. The Grave-digger Beside the Road. 11 June 1943; n.d.
- LD 3035. On the Road to Tripoli. A Cup of Tea for the Burial Party. 11 June 1943; n.d.
- LD 3453. Troops and Civilians Looting in the Town of Reggio on the Days of its Occupation 3rd Sept., 1943. December 1943; n.d.
- LD 4783. An "Ark" (Bridging Tank) Moving into Position at Dawn. 2 February 1945; 28 May 1945.

#### R. Austin

- LD 2395. Wrens Sewing Salvage Float. 1 October 1942; n.d.; contract.
- LD 2398. Wrens Packing Salvaged Float. 1 October 1942; n.d.; contract.

#### E. Bawden

- LD 2069. Waaten Bagush [...] South African Casualty Clearing Station. May 1942; 28 May 1945.
- LD 2070. Waaten Bagush [...] South African Casualty Clearing Station. May 1942; 28 May 1945.
- LD 2071. Waaten Bagush [...] South African Casualty Clearing Station. May 1942; 28 May 1945.
- LD 2890. 2" and 3" Mortar Smoke Bombs. 6 May 1943; 8 January 1945.
- LD 2892. Man Pack Flame Thrower. 6 May 1943; 8 January 1945.
- LD 2893. A Demonstration of the Ronson Flame Thrower. 6 May 1943; 8 January 1945.
- LD 2894. Projector Infantry Anti-tank Gun. 6 May 1943; 8 January 1945.

- LD 2899. Kruschen Activities. Tank Fascines, the Snake, Ronson Flame Throwers [sic?; 5 pictures]. [6 May 1943]; 23 May 1945.
- LD 2900. Ronson Flame Throwers. 6 May 1943; 8 January 1945.
- LD 4097/4098. Penjwin - View of the Leave Camp. n.d.; n.d.

## B.V. Bishop

- LD 3020. Artificial Tree. 26 June 1943; n.d.; purchase.
- LD 3029. Flight Shed. 26 June 1943; n.d.; purchase.

## M. Bone

- LD 396. Small Craft Fitting Out. August 1940. 23 September 1940; 27 September 1940.
- LD 398. The Launch of the "Black Rover". 23 September 1940; n.d.
- LD 1562. Shipping Mines. December 1940. 7 November 1941; n.d.
- LD 4333. The Docks (Building a Mulberry). n.d.; 3 January 1945; purchase.

## S. Bone

- LD 1663. Camouflaging the Pipelines at the British Aluminium Co's Works at Fort William, October 1941. 11 December 1941; 11 December 1944; purchase.
- LD 3109. Drifter on its Way to the Fishing Grounds. 31 August 1943; illegible date; contract.
- LD 3110. R.A.F. Air Sea Rescue Launch. D Type M.L. in Background. 31 August 1943; 6 June 1945; contract.
- LD 3120. The Convoy Anchorage from Lismore. 31 August 1943; 10 February 1945; contract.

- LD 3121. The Convoy Anchorage from Lismore. 7 October 1943; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3126. Six p.m. Drifters Setting out for the Fishing Grounds. 31 August 1943; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3272. Convoy Anchorage from Lismore (2). 7 October 1943; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3273. Convoy. 4.30 a.m. The Start from the Anchorage. 7 October 1943; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3274. Four Crofts and Seven Camouflaged Nissens. 7 October 1943; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3713. The Island from Y Gun Position. [1943]; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3714. At the Tail of the Bank. [1943]; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3715. On Board an Escort Carrier. The Ship H.M.S. "Pursuer". [1943]; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3716. Fighter Direction Office. [1943]; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3717. Fighter Direction Office. The Plot. [1943]; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3718. Armourers in the Hangar. n.d.; n.d.
- LD 3719. Cinema Show in the Hangar. n.d.; n.d.
- LD 3722. Asdic and Hydrophones. [1943]; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3727. Wildcats in the Hangar. [1943]; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3728. The Radar Officer. Lt. Lamont R.N.V.R. at the Radar Controls. n.d.; n.d.
- LD 3729. Muster by Open List. [1943]; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3795. On Board an Escort Carrier. Two Aircraft Carriers - H.M.S. "Formidable" and Another - Fitting Out in Belfast Harbour. [1944]; August 1945; contract.



- LD 3801. On Board an Escort Carrier. H.M.S. "Pursuer" in Belfast Lough. 28 March 1944; August 1945; contract.
- LD 3802. On Board an Escort Carrier. Rescue Motor Launch at Sea, Sunrise. 28 March 1944; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3803. An M.A.C. Ship Shooting at a Droque Target. Arran in Snow Behind. 24 March 1944; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3878. H.M.S. "Wildgoose" and H.M.S. "Sterling". 17 April 1944; n.d.
- LD 4066. Midget Submarine. 1 July 1944; n.d.
- LD 4067. Six Escort Carriers at the Tail of the Bank. 17 July 1944; 29 May 1945.
- LD 4073. Campbeltown Loch. Boom Nets and Floats. R.A.F. Rescue Launch on Slip. Ex French Contre Torpilleur. "L'Incomprise" Beyond. 17 July 1944; 30 May 1945; contract.
- LD 4078. Campbeltown Harbour April 1944. 17 July 1944; 30 May 1945; contract.
- LD 4152. Anti-submarine Class. H.M.S. "St. Modsyn". Petty Officer Instructor and Four Pupils. 13 July 1944; n.d.
- LD 4158. Campbeltown. Wreck of H.M.S. "Breda". 13 July 1944; n.d.
- LD 4364. Courseulles: L.S.T.'s on the Beach. n.d.; n.d.
- LD 4370. Aramanches Les Bains: D.U.K.W.s. n.d.; n.d.
- LD 4371. Frigate, Minesweeper and L.S.T.s at Spithead. 30 August 1944; August 1945.
- LD 4374. H.M.S. "Mauritius". The 4" Guns. 30 August 1944; 29 May 1945.
- LD 4453. An Important Tow [Mulberry being towed to Normandy]. illegible date; 28 May 1945.
- LD 4606. Mulberry Harbour, Arromanches. [1944]; 5 October 1944.

- LD 4607. Mulberry Harbour, Arromanches (2). n.d.; 15 October 1944.
- LD 4608. Mulberry Harbour, Arromanches. [1944]; 5 October 1944.
- LD 4609. Courseulles: The Gooseberry. [1944]; 5 October 1944.
- LD 4610. Mulberry Harbour, Arromanches (5). n.d.; 15 October 1944.
- LD 4611. Mulberry Harbour, Arromanches (6). n.d.; 15 October 1944.

## N. Bull

- LD 2114. Bath's Famous Circus is Saved by the Work of the Bomb Disposal Squad. 1100 lb. Bomb Being Removed. 11 June 1942; 28 May 1945; purchase.

## H. Carr

- LD 2964. Bofors Gun, Algiers. 31 May 1943; 11 December 1944.
- LD 3100. Bridge at Medez El Bab (The Bailey Bridge is the First Put Up In North Africa). illegible date; 20 October 1944.
- LD 3895. 10th Corps Signals. D.R.'s Billets. 21 July 1944; 28 May 1945.
- LD 3900. 7.2 in Action. 21 July 1944; 28 May 1945.
- LD 4061. A 7.2 Firing at Night. August 1944; 11 December 1944.

## B. Casson

- LD 2653. An A.A. Site (Rocket Guns). 12 January 1943; 14 July 1944; purchase.
- LD 2654. An A.A. Site (Rockets). 12 January 1943; 15 July 1944[?], 28 May 1945; purchase.
- LD 2656. Battledress in the Power Station. 12 January 1943; 21 March 1945; purchase.

- LD 2804. The Siren (The Home Guard at the Power Station). 6 March 1943; 20 October 1944; purchase.

W. Clause

- LD 916. Gas Main on Fire. 23 May 1941; 27 May 1941; purchase.

L. Cole

- LD 1834. Glider Construction. Technicians Fitting Undercarriage. 19 February 1942; 17 August 1942; purchase.
- LD 1852. Constructing a Glider. 19 March 1942; 7 August 1942; purchase.
- LD 2464. Ground Operational Exercise. 24 September 1942; 21 December 1942; purchase.
- LD 3251. Study for "Attack on Lampedusa". "Penelope" Laying Smoke Screen at Night. 20 November 1943; n.d.
- LD 3547. Star Shells Over Lampedusa During a Night Bombardment. [17 December 1943]; April 1944.
- LD 3561. Gibraltar. Defence Positions from Rock Gun Looking Towards Africa. 17 December 1943; 21 March 1945[?]
- LD 4285. Flak Meeting Divers as they Cross Coast Defences, Dymchurch, July 1944. 12 September 1944; 21 March 1945.

K. Cook

- LD 2816. British Escapers Brought Back in Chains to Mecheria, Algeria. 26 March 1943; n.d.; purchase.

R. Cowern

- LD 2599. Training in Combined Operations, January 1941. 11 December 1942; n.d.; purchase.

B. Craig

- LD 3015. Camouflage Screens at a Cheshire Factory. 11 June 1943; 26 June 1943[?]; purchase.

C. Cundall

- LD 3009. An O.C.T.U. Station. [1941]; 11 June 1943.

J.S. Dalison

- LD 3815. Oiling from San Tirsan, H.M.S. Lulworth. 17 April 1944; n.d.; purchase.

- LD 3816. The Devils Choice - Pack Ice or U Boats. 17 April 1944; 29 May 1945; purchase.

J. Ensor

- LD 2327. The Launching End of the Stet Bailey Bridge (R.E.s in Training). 15 October 1942; 27 April 1944; purchase.

- LD 2328. Placing the Girder of a Bridge (R.E.s in Training). 6 August 1942; 3 October 1944; purchase.

- LD 3928. An Oil Well in the Midlands from the Geologists Lab, 1944. 11 July 1944; 21 March 1945; purchase.

- LD 3929. Oil Drillers. 11 July 1944; 9 February 1945; purchase.

- LD 3930. Oil Drillers Pulling Out to Change the Drilling Head. 11 July 1944; 21 March 1945; purchase.

- LD 3932. The New Oil Fields in the Midlands, 1944. 11 July 1944; 21 March 1945; contract.

- LD 3933. Oilfields in the Midlands Feb. 1944. 11 July 1944; 21 March 1945; contract.

R. Eurich

- LD 2296. Night Raid, 1941. 6 August 1942; 12 April 1944.

LD 4587. Preparations for "D" Day. n.d.; n.d.

B. Freedman

LD 838. Coast Defence Battery, Sept. 1940. 26 February 1941; March 1941.

LD 4638. Headquarters Room. n.d.; n.d.; purchase.

LD 4639. Beaches and Harbour, Normandy June 1944. [1944]; 20 October 1944; purchase.

T. Freeth

LD 2645. Wireless Operator in an Armoured Command Vehicle. 1 January 1942; 11 December 1944; purchase.

C. Ginner

LD 1882. Emergency Water Storage Tank. 19 March 1942; 19 March 1943; contract.

A. Gross

LD 2038. 1941-1942 Convoy Series. Snow Covered Hills. May 1942; 21 March 1945.

LD 2049. 1941-1942 Convoy Series. Hospital Ship. May 1942; 21 March 1945.

LD 2093. 1941-1942 Convoy Series. Landing Pier. 11 June 1942; 11 December 1944.

LD 2104. 1941-1942 Convoy Series. Aden, 1942. 11 June 1942; 21 March 1945.

LD 2549. The Battle of Egypt. Rehearsal. 92 Squadron Parachute Section Tent. 3 December 1942; 21 March 1945.

LD 2731. Battle of Egypt. Inside Armoured Command Vehicle in Action. 12 February 1943; 21 March 1945.

LD 3176. Subedar Lalbahadur Thapa V.C., 4th Indian Division. 25 August 1943; 27 August 1943.

- LD 3195. Major-General F.I.S. Toker, C.B.E., D.S.O., Brigadier Lovett, D.S.O., Brigadier H.K. Dimoline, C.B.E., D.S.O., T.D., and Brigadier R. Bateman, D.S.O., O.B.E., 4th Indian Division. 25 August 1943; 27 August 1943.
- LD 3196. Subedar-Major Narain Singh, Subedar-Major Argandhar, Regimental Sergeant-Major Rose of the Essex Regiment 5 Brigade, 4th Indian Division. 25 August 1943; 27 August 1943.
- LD 3936. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division, 1944. Headquarter Staff of the 231 (Malta) Brigade: Captain R.T. Gilchrist, Brigadier J. Murray, D.S.O., M.C., Captain H.M. Johnson, Lieutenant L.J.R. Arlidge (Royal Corps of Signals). 18 September 1944; n.d.
- LD 3937. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division, 1944. Brigadier Sir Alexander Stanier, D.S.O., M.C., Commander of 231 Brigade. 18 September 1944; n.d.
- LD 3938. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division, 1944. The 74 (Northumberland) Field Regiment: R.A. Sergeant F. Driscoll, Lance-Sergeant J.A. Wait, Gunner C. Reeves, Battery Sergeant-Major L.A. Trosh, Bombadier H. Ellis. 18 September 1944; n.d.
- LD 3939. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division, 1944. 1 Battalion, Dorsetshire Regiment, 231 Brigade: Sergeant W. Evans, M.M. and Bar, Bandsman D. Bownsall, D.C.M.. 18 September 1944; n.d.
- LD 3940. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division. The Commanding Officer and Officers of the Royal Army Service Corps, Divisional Headquarters. 18 September 1944; n.d.
- LD 3942. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division. 86 (Hertfordshire Yeomanry) Field Regiment, R.A.: Lieutenant-Colonel G.D. Fanshawe, O.B.E., Captain R.R. Thornton, Adjutant, Regimental Sergeant-Major T. Lightfoot. 18 September 1944; n.d.
- LD 3943. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division. 8 Battal-

ion, Durham Light Infantry, 151 Brigade: Lance-Corporal R.G. Goodwin, M.M., Corporal D. Michael, M.M., Major C.L. Beattie, M.C., Corporal W. Higginson, M.M., Sergeant-Major J.R. Hannah, M.M.. 18 September 1944; n.d.

LD 3944. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division. 6 Battalion, Green Howards, 69 Brigade: Major F.H. Honeyman, Lieutenant-Colonel R.H.W.S. Hastings, M.C., Major C.M. Hull, M.C. and Bar, Lieutenant T.T. MacAdam. 18 September 1944; n.d.

LD 3946. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division, 1944. Brigadier R.A. Senior, D.S.O. and Bar, Commander of 151 (The Durham) Brigade. 18 September 1944; n.d.

LD 3947. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division, 1944. Major H.L.V. Faviell, (Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry), Lieutenant-Colonel H.N. Charrington, Lieutenant-Colonel S.B. Simmons, M.C., Royal Tank Regiment. 18 September 1944; n.d.

LD 3948. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division, 1944. Battalion Commanders of the 231 (Malta) Brigade: Lieutenant-Colonel H.D. Nelson-Smith, M.C., 1 Battalion, Hampshire Regiment; Lieutenant-Colonel A.W. Valentine, D.S.O., O.B.E., 2 Battalion, Devonshire Regiment; Lieutenant-Colonel W.H.B. Ray, D.S.O., 1 Battalion, Dorset Regiment. 18 September 1944; n.d.

LD 3949. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division. 69 Brigade: Captain N.H. Nicholson, G.S.P.3, Brigadier F.Y.C. Knox, D.S.O., Major C.P.N. Parker, Brigade Major. 18 September 1944; n.d.

LD 3950. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division. 5 Battalion, East Yorkshire Regiment: Captain W.J. Sugarman, Lieutenant E.J. Crews, Lieutenant-Colonel G.W. White, Lieutenant T.F. Lowe, M.C.. 18 September 1944; n.d.

LD 3952. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division. 1 Battalion, Hampshire Regiment, 231 Brigade: Corporal W. Touzel, M.M., Private F. Woodward, Regimental Sergeant-Major W. Burgess, M.M., Private A. Baker, Lieutenant

- J.A. Arnett, Company Sergeant-Major H. Bowers, M.M., Sergeant E. Harris. 18 September 1944; n.d.
- LD 3953. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division. 7 Battalion, Green Howards, 69 Brigade: Company Quartermaster-Sergeant J. Mason, Lance-Corporal W. Carroll, Company Sergeant-Major R. Braithwaite, Corporal A. Weatherall, Sergeant Y. Yarrow, D.S.M., Sergeant B. Casson. 18 September 1944; n.d.
- LD 3955. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division. 6 Battalion, Durham Light Infantry, 151 Brigade: Private S. Worthington, M.M., Lance-Corporal W. Capon, M.M., the Regimental Sergeant-Major, Sergeant C.R. Haseley, D.C.M., M.M., Sergeant C.R. Critchley, M.M.. 18 September 1944; n.d.
- LD 3956. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division. Forward Observer Bombardment Partyf, 69 Brigade. Signal Rating F. McGrann, Leading Telegraphist A.F. Ryder, Signal Rating P. Currie, Captain J.G. Corke, R.A.. 18 September 1944; n.d.
- LD 3957. The 50th (Northumbrian) Division. 6 Battalion, Green Howards, 69 Brigade: Company Sergeant-Major S.E. Hollis, Private C. Batt, Private J. Armstrong, D.C.M., Regimental Sergeant-Major G. Dixon, Sergeant H. Trenty, Company Quartermaster-Sergeant J. Goodman, B.E.M.. 18 September 1944; n.d.
- LD 4084. 1st United States Infantry Division. Colonel S.B. Mason, Chief of Staff. n.d.; n.d.
- LD 4472. Liberation and Battle of France. Artificial Harbour Erected on the Beaches in Three Weeks. [1944]; 20 October 1944.
- LD 4474. Liberation and Battle of France. The Mulberry (Drawn from the Sea). Artificial Harbour Built Between Arromanches and le Hamel, 9.8.44. n.d.; 20 October 1944.



## E.L. Hall

LD 3021. Inspecting Water Camouflage. 26 June 1943; n.d.; purchase.

LD 3022. Fixing Nets on Model Aircraft. 26 June 1943; n.d.; purchase.

## K. Henderson

LD 256. An Air View of Scotland. 24 June 1940; 11 December 1944.

## T. Hennell

LD 3478. Activity at Docks, Iceland. [1943]; n.d.; contract.

LD 3479. Building a Timber Ship, Hafnafjardur. [1943]; 21 March 1945; contract.

LD 3480. Building a Timber Ship, Hafnafjardur. [1943]; n.d.; contract.

LD 3481. U.S. Troops Laying the New Quay in Concrete at Reykjavik Harbour. [1943]; n.d.; contract.

LD 3495. Loading Parcels, with U.S. Transport Vessel, Reykjavik, August, 1943. [1943]; n.d.; contract.

LD 3496. Main Quay, Reykjavik. [1943]; n.d.; contract.

LD 4259. H.M. Submarine "Rorqual" in Dry Dock. 2 August 1944; n.d.; contract.

LD 4260. Damaged Destroyer at Portsmouth. [1944]; 29 May 1945; contract.

LD 4290. H.M. Submarine "Rorqual" in Dry Dock - No.1. [1944]; n.d.; purchase.

LD 4289. H.M. Submarine "Rorqual" in Dry Dock - No.2. n.d.; n.d.; purchase.

LD 4623. Military Police Searching Prisoners of War, Thiberville. 27 November 1944; n.d.

LD 4625. German Prisoners Being Assembled and

"Frisked" for Weapons. 5 December 1944;  
n.d.

LD 4641. Calais: Avant Port Vue sur le "Risban". 6  
December 1944; 6 June 1945.

LD 4645. Calais: Bassin du Paradis. 6 December 1944;  
6 June 1945.

LD 4743. "Galleries de Paris", Boulogne. n.d.; n.d.

R. Howard Jones

LD 3529. Fortified Islands. Building of the  
North Battery. Dual Purpose 4.5", Flat-  
holm, Bristol Channel. [1943]; n.d.; con-  
tract.

R. Hurle

LD 3704. Hunt Class Upright Funnel in Dry Dock.  
[1944]; 10 February 1945; purchase.

H. Johns

LD 3353. The Retreat of the British Armoured Brigade  
in Greece (1). 19 October 1943; 6 June  
1945; purchase.

LD 3354. The Retreat of the British Armoured Brigade  
in Greece (2). 19 October 1943; 6 June  
1945; purchase.

C. Kennedy

LD 2756. Erecting Netting at a Factory. February  
1943; n.d.; purchase.

LD 2757. Men Fixing Netting Over a Factory. February  
1943; n.d.; purchase.

LD 2758. Camouflaged Runway. n.d.; n.d.; purchase.

J. Kenward

LD 1918. Recruits Training. 30 April 1942; 21 March  
1945; purchase.

## F. Macdonald

- LD 2984. Chelsea Old Church. 29 May 1943; 7 July 1943; purchase.
- LD 3880. The Docks. 19 April 1944; 3 January 1945; contract.
- LD 3925. Sketch for "The Docks". [April 1944]; 3 January 1945; purchase.
- LD 4039. London Docks. 11 July 1944; 20 October 1944; contract.
- LD 4410. Experimental Bridging Establishment. 8 September 1944; 6 June 1945; purchase.

## W.D. Macleod

- LD 1649. "Z" Battery in Action, 1941. 4 December 1941; n.d.; purchase.

## H. McWilliams

- LD 2003. Quarter View of M.G.B.. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2004. M.G.B. at Speed. 9 July 1942; n.d. purchase.
- LD 2005. Construction of D Type M.L., Lowestoft. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2139. M.L.s Alongside Hamilton Dock, Lowestoft. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2140. Trawler in Dry Dock at Lowestoft. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2141. Sketch for Construction of D Type M.L., Lowestoft. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2142. M.L. at Sea. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2143. Guns of an M.G.B.. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2144. [Title uncertain]. 9 July 1942; n.d.;

purchase.

- LD 2145. D Type M.L. Ready to be Launched. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2146. Wavency Dock, Lowestoft [sic?]. 9 July 1942; n.d.; purchase.
- LD 2168. Dome Teacherk. 9 July 1942; n.d.; purchase.
- LD 2169. M.L. Alongside at Lowestoft. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2170. Two M.L.s at Lowestoft. 9 July 1942; n.d.; purchase.
- LD 2175. S.G.B., Lowestoft. 9 July 1942; n.d.; purchase.
- LD 2172. M.G.B.s, Hamilton Dock, Lowestoft. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2173. Stern of a M.L. on the Slip, Lowestoft. 9 July 1942; 30 May 1945; purchase.
- LD 2174. Hamilton Dock, Lowestoft. 9 July 1942; n.d.; purchase.
- LD 2200. Bows of Two M.L.s on the Slips, Lowestoft. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2204. M.G.B. at Half Speed. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2205. Props. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2206. Shipbuilding Yard, Lowestoft. 9 July 1942; 1945; purchase.
- LD 2611. H.M.S. "Hecla" Sinking off West Coast of Morocco. 11 December 1942; n.d.; purchase.
- LD 2612. H.M.S. "Hecla" Sinking, with the Destroyer "Marne" Torpedoed While Picking Up Survivors. 11 December 1942; n.d.; purchase.

Paul Methuen

LD 785. Charing Cross Road, London, Late Autumn.  
[1941]; 17 December 1942; purchase.

LD 4043. West India Dock, 30 April 1944. 11 July  
1944; 3 January 1945[?], 21 March  
1945; purchase.

LD 4044. Invasion Craft in West India Docks,  
April 1944. [1944]; 11 July 1944;  
contract.

J. Miller

LD 4137. "Whales". 17 June 1944; 3 January 1945; con-  
tract.

W.T. Monnington

LD 4890. Antwerp (3). 5 March 1945; n.d.; con-  
tract.

LD 4892. Airfield Buildings Destroyed by  
Germans, Deurne, Antwerp[?]. 5 March  
1945; n.d.; contract.

E.B. Musman

LD 2613. The Spotter. 11 December 1942; 11 December  
1944; purchase.

C. Pears

LD 1916. German Searchlight Across the English  
Channel. 1 April 1942; n.d.; purchase.

LD 1487. Handing Over a Convoy from American to  
British Escorts . 27 November 1941 [sic];  
11 October 1941 [sic]; subsequently  
stopped by Admiralty; contract.

C. Perkins

LD 1602. Set Piece for a Shot in the Dark. 20 No-  
vember 1941; n.d.; purchase.

LD 1903. Sunderland Immobilised by Ice. 21 July

1942; 11 December 1944; purchase.

R.V. Pitchforth

- LD 938. Post Office Buildings Telephone Exchange. April 1941; n.d.; contract.
- LD 939. Post Office Buildings (1). April 1941; n.d.; contract.
- LD 943. Post Office Buildings. April 1941; n.d.; contract.
- LD 1204. Telephone Exchange. [February 1942]; n.d.; contract.
- LD 1992. Speed Boats at Station. 21 May 1942; 3 January 1945; contract.
- LD 2303. Parachutes Being Tested for Performance at Henlow. 6 August 1942; 3 January 1945; contract.
- LD 2433. A Sunderland up for Overhaul. [1942]; n.d.; contract.
- LD 2434. Flying Control at Group. 20 November 1942; 8 February 1945; contract.
- LD 2435. Early Morning "Mount Batten". [1942]; 20 November 1942; contract.
- LD 2436. Sunderland Taking off at Plymouth (1). [1942]; 20 November 1942; contract.
- LD 2437. Sunderland Taking off at Plymouth (2). [1942]; 20 November 1942; contract.
- LD 2438. Operations Room at Mount Wise, Plymouth. 20 November 1942; 21 March 1945; contract.
- LD 2440. Sunderlands in Plymouth Sound. [1942]; 20 November 1942; contract.
- LD 2442. Sunderlands at Plymouth. [1942]; 20 November 1942; contract.
- LD 2443. Sunderlands Moored at Plymouth. [1942]; 20 November 1942; contract.
- LD 2444. Activities Begin as Soon as Mist Blows

- Out to Sea. n.d.; 20 November 1942; contract.
- LD 2447. Pulling a Sunderland up on the Slipway. [1942]; 3 January 1945; contract.
- LD 2448. Mount Batten Station. [1942]; 21 March 1945; contract.
- LD 2449. Sunderland Taking Off at Plymouth (3). [1942]; 20 November 1942; contract.
- LD 3406. Gun Boats Going on Exercise - Portland Coastal Force Base. November[?] 1943; 1945; contract.
- LD 3407. Embarkation Practice, Portland. 10 December 1943; 6 June 1945; contract.
- LD 3408. Portland Base. November 1943; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3409. The Slips Coastal Force Base, Portland. 20 November 1943; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3412. Coal Wharf, Portland. 10 December 1943; 1945; contract.
- LD 3414. Portland Harbour. November 1943; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3416. Coastal Force Base, Portland. 10 December 1943; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3417. Coastal Force Base, Portland. 20 November 1943; 1945; contract.
- LD 3427. Motor Launches Secured Alongside a Coal Wharf, Portland. 10 December 1943; 1945; contract.
- LD 3428. Coastal Force Base, Portland. 10 December 1943; 1945; contract.
- LD 3441. Motor Gun Boats Going on Operations. 10 December 1943; n.d.; contract.
- LD 3832. Little Ships on Patrol. 24 March 1944; n.d.; contract.

- LD 4847. Submarines at Londonderry for Training Escorts. 10 March 1945; n.d.
- LD 4857. "Philante" Training Escort Group off Larne. 19 March 1945; n.d.
- LD 4858. Torpedoed Frigate and Frigate Base, Pollock Dock, Belfast. 10 March 1945; n.d.
- LD 4869. Hoisting Black Pennant. 10 March 1945; n.d.
- LD 4876. A Convoy Leaving Gibraltar. 10 March 1945; n.d.
- LD 4882. Escort Oiling at Sea from Tanker on the Way to Gibraltar. 10 March 1945; n.d.

## J. Piper

- LD 4540. Repairs and Repainting Warships Returned from the Beaches; Bristol. 20 November 1944; n.d.

## G. Plante

- LD 3055. Rescue Ship - Atlantic, March 1943. 20 July 1943; n.d.; purchase.

## J. Platt

- LD 2302. A Convoy Arriving at St. Anthony's Lighthouse. 6 August 1942; 9 November 1942; purchase.
- LD 2416. Convoy Passing the Lizard. 10 September 1942; 9 November 1942; purchase.
- LD 2638. Wartime River Traffic. River Mine-sweeper. 1 January 1943; 21 March 1945; purchase.
- LD 2639. Wartime River Traffic. After Dieppe: Up River for Repair. 1 January 1943; 3 January 1945; purchase.
- LD 2640. Wartime River Traffic. War Supplies (St. Paul's Wharf). 1 January 1943; n.d.;



purchase.

E. Ravilious

LD 636. Coastal Defences (3). November 1941; 3 January 1945; contract.

LD 1585. Firing a 9.2 Gun (3). November 1941; 3 January 1945; contract.

LD 1592. South Coast Beach (5). November 1941; 3 January 1945; contract.

W.T. Rawlinson

LD 3203. An American Transport Landing Craft Conveys an R.A.F. Unit to Sicily. 19 October 1943; 3 January 1945; purchase.

A. Richards

LD 1125. Sappers Erecting Pickets in the Snow. 26 May 1941; 11 December 1944; purchase.

LD 1454. R.E. Dump, Essex. 25 September 1941; 11 December 1944; purchase.

LD 1941. Anti-tank Ditch. 30 April 1942; 11 December 1944; purchase.

LD 3924. The Drop. June 1944; 11 December 1944.

A. Ronald

LD 4221. Aircraft Carrier "Furious" at Rosyth. [1944]; 21 March 1945; purchase.

A. Sorrell

LD 3077. A Hutted Encampment. 20 July 1943; 7 August 1943; contract.

LD 3921. Southampton Dock. 12 June 1944; 11 December 1944; contract.

LD 4186. R.A.F. Landing Ground with "Frying Pan" and

"Spectacle" Dispersal Points and Traces of Camouflage on Landing Ground. 11 July 1944; 28 May 1945; purchase.

F. Sutton

LD 3706. Specimen Sky-tones, Used for Initial Stages in Camouflage Design. 18 January 1944; n.d.; purchase.

N.B. Town

LD 2871. A Shaft with Men Operating Water Pump. 6 May 1943; n.d.; purchase.

LD 2872. Uncovering Bomb. 6 May 1943; n.d.; purchase.

LD 2873. Lashing Bomb Before Hauling to Surface. 6 May 1943; n.d.; purchase.

C. Upton

LD 2275. Bringing Up a Two Hundred and Fifty Kilo Bomb. 23 July 1942; n.d.; purchase.

LD 2276. Listening for Ticking. 23 July 1942; n.d.; purchase.

N. Wilkinson

LD 4309. Sunderland Flying Boat Rescuing the Crew of a Liberator and Those of Another Sunderland Which had Crashed in the Bay of Biscay. [1944]; n.d.; presented.

H.W. Williamson

LD 1188. St. Martin's-le-Grand, January 1941. 28 May 1941; 27 November 1942; contract.

J. Worsley

LD 3012. "Away Walrus" from H.M.S. "Devonshire" at Sea. 11 June 1943; 7 August 1943; purchase.

chase.

LD 3379. H.M.S. "Newfoundland" in Dry Dock in Malta.  
The Stern was Hit by Torpedo and Blown  
Off. August 1943. [1943]; n.d.

Appendix 4WAAC Exhibitions in the Provinces

This appendix is compiled from information given in the annual reports of the War Artists' Advisory Committee, and from lists filed in GP/46/24/13.

1) First exhibition for larger provincial centres, circulated by the Museums Association:

Liverpool. Blue Coat Chambers	7-22 December 1940
Manchester. City Art Gallery	13 January-8 February 1941
Glasgow. Kelvingrove Art Galleries	22 February-15 March 1941
Aberdeen. Art Gallery	22 March-14 April 1941
Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Laing Art Gallery	23 April-10 June 1941
Norwich. Castle Museum and Art Gallery	18 June-19 July 1941
Leicester. Museum and Art Gallery	31 July-19 August 1941
Brighton. Art Gallery and Art Gallery	1-20 September 1941
Bristol. Art Gallery	1-22 October 1941
Reading. Museum and Art Gallery	1-22 November 1941
Halifax. Bankfield Museum	2-27 December 1941
Stoke. Public Museum and Art Gallery	5-24 January 1942

Middlesbrough. Art Gallery	5-26 February 1942
Mansfield. Museum and Art Gallery	18-30 March 1942
Wolverhampton. Municipal Art Gallery	9-30 April 1942
Cheltenham. Art Gallery	11-30 May 1942
Bath. Victoria Art Gallery	8-27 June 1942
Hereford. Art Gallery	11-31 August 1942

2) Second exhibition for larger provincial centres, circulated by the Museums Association:

Middlesbrough. Art Gallery	8-29 March 1941
Edinburgh. National Gallery of Scotland	12 April-10 May 1941
Sunderland. Museum and Art Gallery	21 May-11 June 1941
Stoke-on-Trent. Museum and Art Gallery, Hanley	20 June-10 July 1941
Salford. Art Gallery	21 July-9 August 1941
Bradford. Cartwright Memorial Hall	20 August-9 September 1941
Leeds. Reference Library Exhibition Gallery	20 September-10 October 1941
Derby. Museum and Art Gallery	22 October-11 November 1941
Loughborough. Art Gallery	22 November-13 December 1941
Northampton. Central Museum and Art Gallery	29 December-17 January 1942
Norwich. Castle Museum and Art Gallery	29 January-19 February 1942

Doncaster. Art Gallery and Museum	28 February-22 March 1942
Scarborough. Public Library	2-25 April 1942
Bolton. Museum and Art Gallery	7-28 May 1942
Wolverhampton. Municipal Art Gallery	13 July-8 August 1942
Mansfield. Museum and Art Gallery	24 August-12 September 1942
Cheltenham. Art Gallery	1-21 November 1942

3) Third exhibition for larger provincial centres, circulated  
by the Museums Association:

Liverpool. Walker Art Gallery	11-31 January 1943
Warrington. Municipal Museum and Art Gallery	11 February-3 March 1943
Port Sunlight. Lady Lever Art Gallery	15 March-3 April 1943
Birkenhead. Williamson Art Gallery and Museum	12-30 April 1943
Derby. Museum and Art Gallery	11-31 May 1943
Salford. Art Gallery and Museum	10-30 June 1943
Rochdale. Art Gallery and Museum	17 July-7 August 1943
Bradford. Cartwright Memorial Hall	18 August-18 September 1943
Lincoln. Usher Art Gallery and City Museum	20 September-10 October 1943
Oldham. Municipal Art Gallery	21 October-11 November 1943
Doncaster. Art Gallery and Museum	15 January-6 February 1944

4) Fourth exhibition for larger provincial centres, circulated by the Museums Association:

Preston. Harris Museum and Art Gallery	2-23 January 1943
Oldham. Municipal Art Gallery	4-24 February 1943
Halifax. Bankfield Museum	13 March-10 April 1943
Sheffield. Graves Art Gallery	1-22 May 1943
Mansfield. Museum and Art Gallery	2-23 June 1943
Stoke-on-Trent. Public Museum and Art Gallery	4-25 July 1943
Hereford. Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery	18 August-8 September 1943
Bath. Victoria Art Gallery	20 October-10 November 1943
Worcester. Hastings Museum	22 November-12 December 1943
Bristol. Museum and Art Gallery	23 December 1943-12 January 1944

5) Fifth exhibition for larger provincial centres, circulated by the Museums Association:

Bristol. Museum and Art Gallery	23 March-15 April 1944
Mansfield. Museum and Art Gallery	25 April-May 1944
Liverpool. Walker Art Gallery	29 May-19 June 1944
Warrington. Municipal Art Gallery	30 June-2_ July 1944
Halifax. Bankfield Museum	5 August-2 September 1944

Hull. Ferens Art Gallery	15 September-7 October 1944
[?; Lancashire]. Historical Rooms	19 October-8 November 1944
Burton-on-Trent. Museum and Art Gallery	23 November-19[?] December 1944
Northampton. Central Museum and Art Gallery	27 December 1944-30 January 1945

6) First exhibition for smaller provincial centres, circulated  
by the British Institute of Adult Education:

Rochdale. Art Gallery and Museum Attendance: 4604	20 January-15 February 1941
Colchester. Castle Museum Attendance: 11,500	20 February-20 March 1941
Mansfield. Museum and Art Gallery Attendance: 6978	3-26 April 1941
Blackburn. Lewes Textile Museum Attendance: 6859	7-31 May 1941
Wolverhampton. Art Gallery Attendance: 9000	5 June-2 July 1941
Wakefield. City Art Gallery Attendance: 5000	5-26 July 1941
Harrogate. Public Library and Art Gallery Attendance: 4660	2-20 August 1941
Kettering. Art Gallery Attendance: 5020	1-27 September 1941
Kidderminster. Art Gallery Attendance: 2970	8 October-8 November 1941



Lincoln. Art Gallery	24 November-27 December 1941
Attendance: 4494	
Watford. Central Public Library	5-18 February 1942
Attendance: 2477	
Sutton. School of Art	28 February-14 March 1942
Attendance: 2300	
Birmingham. Royal Birmingham Society of Artists	11 May-7 June 1942
Attendance: 5113	
Chester. Cathedral refectory	13 June-4 July 1942
Attendance: 8974	
Leicester. Museum and Art Gallery	13 July-23 August 1942
Attendance: 16,615	
Lowestoft. Messrs. Tuttle Waveney Galleries	31 August-12 September 1942
Attendance: 946	
Hyde. Bayley Hall	17-31 October 1942
Wallasey. School of Art	14-22 November 1942
Attendance: 1387	
Redditch. Gas Company Showrooms	25 January-6 February 1943
Attendance: 4174	
Woolwich. Town Hall	31 March-14 April 1943
Attendance: 3200	
Merthyr Tydfil. Museum and Art Gallery	7-21 May 1943
Attendance: 3393	
Penzance. School of Art	4 June-2 July 1943
Attendance: 2556	
Barnstaple. Art, Science and Commercial School	10-21 July 1943
Torquay. School of Art and Crafts	2-14 August 1943

7) Second exhibition for smaller provincial centres, circulated by the British Institute of Adult Education:

Larkhill. Royal Artillery Attendance: 400	3-10 November 1941
Cheltenham. School of Art Attendance: 371	22-29 November 1941
Gloucester. School of Art Attendance: 605	1-6 December 1941
Lydney. School of Art Attendance: 915	8-13 December 1941
Bordon. New Martinique Barracks	16 February-6 March 1942
Bulford. "Sunday Times" Library Attendance: 1200	15-20 March 1942
Tidworth. Garrison Junior School Attendance: 170	22-27 March 1942
Dorchester. Corn Exchange Attendance: 769	2-4 April 1942
Poole. Parkstone Grammar School Attendance: 456	7-9 April 1942
Salisbury. School of Art Attendance: 700	13-25 April 1942
Bovington. Garrison	27-30 April 1942
Plymouth. Hyde Park Social Centre	3-8 May 1942
Shirehampton. Methodist Hall Attendance: 280	11-13 June 1942
Glasgow. City Police Canteen	1-15 July 1942
Paisley. Art Gallery	18-31 July 1942
Dundee. Art Gallery	August 1942
Montrose. Town Hall	August 1942
Aberdeen. Art Gallery	9-23 September 1942

Coventry. Ministry of Labour Hostel	17 October-10 December 1942
Coventry. British Thomson Houston	14-31 December 1942
Coventry. Messrs. Mechaniza- tion & Aero	1-14 January 1943
Uttoxeter. Abbotsholme School	11-25 February 1943
Tamworth. Electricity Show- rooms Attendance: 1200	26 April-8 May 1943
Donnington. YMCA Education Hut	27 May-10 June 1943
Brighton. Art Gallery	26 June-24 July 1943
Hackney. Town Hall	9-21 August 1943

8) Third exhibition for smaller provincial centres, circulated  
by the British Institute of Adult Education:

Braintree. Corn Exchange Attendance: 12,000	1-14 March 1942
Wakefield. Art Gallery	21 March-4 April 1942
Tottenham. British Restaurant, Rowland Hill School	[April] 1942
Tottenham. British Restaurant, Devonshire School	[May] 1942
Tottenham. British Restaurant, Calvert School	[June] 1942
Gillingham (Kent). Public Library Attendance: 1656	20 July-8 August 1942
Chesterfield. Public Library	17-29 August 1942

[various Army facilities in eastern and central England]	September-December 1942
Dunball. Monmouth Hall Attendance: 360	8-20 March 1943
Hoylake. 10 Market Street Attendance: 1587	1-14 May 1943
Poole. Royal Ordnance Factory	6-19 June 1943
Sherborne. Westlands Aircraft Factory	28 June-10 July 1943
Crosby-on-Eden. R.A.F. Station	August 1943

9) Fourth exhibition for smaller provincial centres,  
circulated by the British Institute of Adult Education:

Northampton. YMCA	1-14 March 1944
Swindon. Town Hall	8-20 May 1944
West Bromwich. Ryland Memorial School of Art	12-24 June 1944
Gillingham. Public Library	12[?]-18[?] July 1944
Weston-super-Mare. School of Science and Art	20 July-3 August 1944
Bridgwater. County Girls' School	14-26 August 1944
St. Athan. R.A.F. Station	September 1944
Beeston. County Branch Library	16-28 September 1944
[West Bridgford. County Branch Library	16-28 September 1944]
Retford. County Branch Library	2-12 October 1944
Tuddenham. R.A.F. Station	13 November-3 December 1944

Luton. Vauxhall Motors Limited	7-21 December 1944
Guildford. Public Libraries	12 February-3 March 1945

Appendix 51945 Burlington House ExhibitionOfficial War Artist Representation

Edward Ardizzone: 68	A.R. Thomson: 15
Anthony Gross: 61	Paul Nash: 14
William Dring: 47	John Piper: 13
Albert Richards: 40	John Worsley: 13
Henry Carr: 39	Rodrigo Moynihan: 9
Leslie Cole: 39	Barnett Freedman: 7
Stephen Bone: 38	Charles Wheelr: 7
Edward Bawden: 37	William Coldstream: 6
Thomas Hennell: 35	W.T. Monnington: 6
Henry Lamb: 32	Rudolph Shephard: 6
Graham Sutherland: 29	R.G. Eves: 4
Eric Ravillious: 28	Keith Henderson: 4
R.V. Pitchforth: 25	John Platt: 4
Eric Kennington: 21	Leonard Rosoman: 4
Muirhead Bone: 20	James Morris: 2
Charles Cundall: 20	John Nash: 2
Richard Eurich: 20	Mervyn Peake: 2
Evelyn Dunbar: 17	Carel Weight: 2
Bernard Hailstone: 15	

Artists Who Worked on Short-term Contracts for the WAACIncluded:

Leonard Appelbee	Arthur Ensor
John Armstrong	Jacob Epstein
Robert Austin	Hubert Freeth
James Bateman	Ethel Gabain
Thomas Carr	Charles Ginner
William Clause	Allan Gwynne-Jones
Dorothy Coke	Clifford Hall
Robert Colquhoun	Archibald Hartrick
William Conor	Norman Hepple
James Cowie	Percy Horton
Raymond Coxon	F. Ernest Jackson
Hugh Crawford	Edmond Kapp
Anthony Devas	Laura Knight
Frank Dobson	L.S. Lowry
Francis Dodd	Lowe Luard
T.C. Dugdale	Frances Macdonald
C.W. Dyson-Smith	Alexander Macpherson
Ian Eadie	Robert Medley

Paul Methuen  
 James Miller  
 Henry Moore  
 W.P. Moss  
 Cuthbert Orde  
 Charles Pears  
 Ceri Richards  
 William Roberts  
 Claude Rogers  
 Kenneth Rowntree  
 Henry Rushbury  
 Walter Russell  
 Randolph Schwabe

Robert Sivell  
 John Skeaping  
 Alan Sorrell  
 Ruskin Spear  
 Gilbert Spencer  
 Stanley Spencer  
 Steven Spurrier  
 E. Heber Thompson  
 A.R. Middleton Todd  
 Feliks Topolski  
 John Wheatley  
 Harold Williamson  
 W. Matvyn Wright

Not included:

Rosemary Allan  
 Edward Baird  
 Malcolm Baker-Smith  
 Walter Bayes  
 Frank Beresford  
 Oswald Birley  
 David Bomberg  
 Rodney Burn  
 Bernard Casson  
 Evan Charlton  
 Derek Chittock  
 Dora Clarke  
 Philip Connard  
 Barry Craig  
 Terence Cuneo  
 Robin Darwin  
 Paul Drury  
 Vincent Evans  
 Evelyn Gibbs

Duncan Grant  
 James Grant  
 Kenneth Green  
 James Gunn  
 Robin Guthrie  
 C. Eliot Hodgkin  
 Ray Howard-Jones  
 Blair Hughes-Stanton  
 Mary Kessell  
 Wyndham Lewis  
 Neville Lytton  
 Raymond McGrath  
 Bernard Meninsky  
 Mona Moore  
 Harry Morley  
 Patrick E. Phillips  
 Elizabeth Polunin  
 Patricia Preece  
 Peter Scott  
 David M. Sutherland

Artists Who Sold or Donated Work to the WAAC

Included:

G. Worsley Adamson  
 Edgar Ainsworth  
 Adrian Allinson  
 John Berry  
 Sam Black  
 A. Boothroyd  
 John Kingsley Cook  
 Leonard Daniels  
 Louis Duffy

Alan Durst  
 Frederick Elwell  
 Leila Faithfull  
 Dennis Flanders  
 William Russell Flint  
 Michael Ford  
 Meredith Frampton  
 Thomas Freeth  
 A.H. Gerrard

Phyllis Ginger  
 Grace Golden  
 W. Goodin  
 Thomas Gourdie  
 W.S. Haines  
 Elsie Hewland  
 Francis Hodge  
 Ruth Hurle  
 Edward James  
 Norman Janes  
 Eve Kirk  
 T.E. La Dell  
 George Lambourn  
 Lawrence S. Lee  
 John Mansbridge  
 Reginald Mills  
 C. Mozley

Charles Murray  
 Richard Murry  
 R.H. Payne  
 Christopher Perkins  
 Roger Pettiward  
 Michael Rothenstein  
 William Rothenstein  
 Robert Scanlan  
 Stella Schmolle  
 Julius Stafford-Baker  
 E. Trimnell-Richard  
 E. Boye Uden  
 Clive Upton  
 Norman Wilkinson  
 Frank Wootton  
 Anna Zinkeisen  
 Doris Zinkeisen

Not included:

Enid Abrahams	Robert Campbell
L. Abrahams	Patrick Carpenter
Mary Adshead	Jack Chaddock
Griselda Allan	D. Champion
Kathleen S. Allen	Miles Chance
Joshua Armitage	Charles Chaplin
Michael Ayrton	Daphne Chart
Edward Bainbridge-Copnall	
Denis Barnham	Malvina Cheek
Joseph Bato	George Claessen
Ivor Beddoes	Joy Collier
Bernard Beekes	A.C. Collins
D.S. Bertram	Joan Connew
Paul Bird	Frederick Cook
B.V. Bishop	Hubert Cook
Douglas Bissett	Frederick Coventry
George Bissill	Raymond Cower
Doris Blair	H.R. Cox
R. Henderson Blyth	B.J. Cumming
James Boswell	Peter Curl
A.C. Bown	J.S. Dalison
Oliver Brabbins	Leonard Daniels
William Brealey	W.D. Brokman Davis
J. Brooks	Miles de Montmorency
John Brown	Paul Dessau
Kenneth G. Browne	John Dixon
Maurice Broadfoot	F. Dunbar-Marshall
Harold Bubb	Charles Dunn
Norma Bull	Pamela Dunton
William Burwell	Gil Dyer
Robert Butler	Eric Earnshaw



G.O. Eldridge  
 Clifford Ellis  
 Simon Elwes  
 John Farleigh  
 David Feilding  
 V. Ferguson  
 Frank Field  
 F.M.R. Flint  
 Victorine Foot  
 M. Forestier-Walker  
 Roger Furse  
 Abram Games  
 G.R. Geary  
 Mrs. K. Gerrard  
 Patrick Gierth  
 Paul Gillett  
 Frank Graves  
 A.A. Gregson  
 Julius Griffith  
 Kathleen Guthrie  
 Karl Hagedorn  
 Harold Hailstone  
 Eric L. Hall  
 Patrick Hall  
 Thomas Halliday  
 H.L. Harcourt  
 Martin Hardie  
 Hilda Harrisson  
 Carl Haworth  
 Rudolf Haybrook  
 Colin Hayes  
 J.C. Heath  
 Francis Helps  
 Rose Henriques  
 L. Hinshelwood  
 Kenneth Holmes  
 Francis Holtermann  
 Stanley Houghton  
 Blair Howitt-Lodge  
 E. Erlund Hudson  
 Mabel Hutchinson  
 Philip Hutton  
 Alex Ingram  
 H. Johns  
 Barbara Jones  
 G.W. Kairigo  
 Katongale  
 Pegaret Keeling  
 L.E.D. Keene  
 Cedric J. Kennedy  
 James Kenward  
 B. Ley Kenyon

Morris Kestelman  
 C. Kestin  
 S. Kioni  
 Akinola Lasekan  
 Nora Lavrin  
 V.J. Lee  
 Olga Lehmann  
 Vincent Lines  
 A.K. Lugolobi  
 Richard Macdonald  
 Joseph McCulloch  
 W. Douglas Macleod  
 Herbert McWilliams  
 P.W.G. Maloba  
 John Mansbridge  
 Edward Mansfield  
 Charles Marsden  
 Frank H. Mason  
 Denis Mathews  
 George Melhuish  
 H.S. Merritt  
 Robert Miller  
 V. Baber Mimirriss  
 Louis Mitelle  
 Colin Moss  
 Brian Mullen  
 John Munday  
 E.B. Musman  
 John Napper  
 Edmund Nelson  
 C.R.W. Nevinson  
 Roger Nicholson  
 Roy Nockolds  
 L. Noke  
 Frank Norton  
 G. Obath  
 S. Okello  
 Herbert Olivier  
 G.W. Lennox Paterson  
 T.W. Pattison  
 Edward Payne  
 C.J. Pearce  
 Ivan Peries  
 George Plante  
 Louisa Puller  
 George Quarmby  
 F. Quinton  
 W.T. Rawlinson  
 F. Reed  
 Retziba  
 Ceri Richards  
 Leonard Richmond

**S. Robertson-Rodgers**

Alan Ronald  
C.A. Russell  
J.A. Russell  
C.A. Salisbury  
Noel Sampson  
Edward Seago  
Richard Seddon  
E. Shepherd  
B. Gordon Smith  
David T. Smith  
Sidney Smith  
Alexander Sonnis  
J.M. Spence  
John Staerck  
P.T. Stainforth  
John Stephenson  
Juan Stoll  
Ian Strang  
Felicity Sutton  
I.K. Sydee  
Eric W. Taylor  
Richard Taylor  
Patrick Thompson  
N.B. Town  
Julian Trevelyan

Henry Trivick  
G.A. Tuckwell  
C.C. Turner  
Keith Vaughan  
Paule Vezelay  
S. Curnow Vosper  
F.C. Ward  
John Ward  
William Ware  
William Washington  
Aubrey Waterfield  
Barbara Watson  
G.P.H. Watson  
A.M. Weston  
Garth Weston  
Peter Whalley  
Tom White  
G.W. Whittam  
Kaete Wilczynski  
Anne F. Wilson  
J. Wood  
E.J. Worrall  
H.W. Yates  
J. Yunge-Bateman  
A. Zabalam

Appendix 6Sample Post-War Distribution of WAAC Art1) Locations of Non-Exchequer Bodies<sup>6</sup> Receiving War Art:In Britain:

Aberdeen	Leeds
Belfast	Lincoln
Birmingham	Liverpool
Bournemouth	London
Bradford	Manchester
Brighton	Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Bristol	Oxford
Camberwell	Paisley
Cardiff	Preston
Chelsea	Rugby
Cheltenham	Salford
Chorley	Sheffield
Coventry	Southampton
Derby	Stoke-on-Trent
Dundee	Wakefield
Edinburgh	Wallasey
Glasgow	Westminster (City)
Harrogate	Wolverhampton
Hull	

Abroad:

Australia  
 Canada  
 Malta  
 New Zealand  
 South Africa  
 Sudan

2) Institutions Receiving Works by Paul Nash:In Britain:

Museum and Art Gallery, Birmingham (3)  
 Museum and Art Gallery, Brighton (4)  
 Museum and Art Gallery, Cheltenham (2)  
 Astley Hall Art Gallery, Chorley (1)  
 City Art Gallery, Glasgow (1)  
 Ferens Art Gallery, Hull (1)

---

<sup>6</sup> i.e., art galleries, museums, government departments, etc.

City Art Gallery, Leeds (3)  
 Usher Art Gallery, Lincoln (3)  
 Air Ministry, London (4)  
 Imperial War Museum, London (4)  
 Tate Gallery, London (3)  
 City Art Gallery, Manchester (1)  
 Rutherford Loan Scheme, Manchester (1)  
 Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester (1)  
 Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (3)

Abroad:

Queensland National Art Gallery, Brisbane (1)  
 Australian War Memorial, Canberra (1)  
 National Gallery of South Africa, Cape Town (2)  
 National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne (1)  
 National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa (2)  
 Museum and Art Gallery, Perth, Australia (1)  
 Warrnambool, Victoria, Australia (1)

3) Institutions Receiving Works by Graham Sutherland:

In Britain:

Art Gallery, Aberdeen (1)  
 Museum and Art Gallery, Birmingham (3)  
 Russell-Coates Art Gallery, Bournemouth (1)  
 Cartwright Memorial Art Gallery, Bradford (2)  
 Museum and Art Gallery, Brighton (2)  
 City Art Gallery, Bristol (1)  
 National Museum of Wales, Cardiff (19)  
 Museum and Art Gallery, Cheltenham (2)  
 Astley Hall Art Gallery, Chorley (1)  
 Herbert Art Gallery, Coventry (1)  
 Central Art Gallery, Dundee (1)  
 City Art Gallery, Glasgow (1)  
 Ferens Art Gallery, Hull (1)  
 City Art Gallery, Leeds (6)  
 Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool (1)  
 Air Ministry, London (2)  
 British Council, London (4)  
 Imperial War Museum, London (6)  
 London Museum (1)  
 South London Art Gallery (2)  
 Tate Gallery, London (9)  
 City Art Gallery, Manchester (4)  
 Rutherford Loan Scheme, Manchester (6)  
 Laing Art Gallery, Newcastle-upon-Tyne (4)  
 Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (2)  
 Museum and Art Galleries, Paisley (1)  
 City Art Gallery, Salford (1)  
 Graves Art Gallery, Sheffield (3)

Museum and Art Gallery, Stoke-on-Trent (2)  
 City Art Gallery, Wakefield (3)

Abroad:

National Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide (1)  
 Art Gallery, Bendigo, Victoria, Australia (1)  
 National Gallery of New South Wales, Australia (1)

4) Institutions Receiving Works by John Piper

In Britain:

Museum and Art Gallery, Birmingham (2)  
 Cartwright Memorial Art Gallery, Bradford (1)  
 City Art Gallery, Bristol (4)  
 National Museum of Wales, Cardiff (2)  
 Museum and Art Gallery, Cheltenham (2)  
 Herbert Art Gallery, Coventry (2)  
 City Art Gallery, Glasgow (1)  
 Ferens Art Gallery, Hull (1)  
 City Art Gallery, Leeds (2)  
 British Council, London (1)  
 Imperial War Museum, London (6)  
 London Museum (1)  
 Ministry of Works, London (2)  
 National Maritime Museum, London (3)  
 Tate Gallery, London (3)  
 City Art Gallery, Manchester (2)  
 Rutherford Loan Scheme, Manchester (4)  
 Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester (1)

Abroad:

Art Gallery, Ballarat, Victoria, Australia (1)  
 National Gallery of New South Wales, Sydney (1)

5) Institutions Receiving Works by Henry Moore:

In Britain:

Museum and Art Gallery, Birmingham (2)  
 City Art Gallery, Glasgow (1)  
 City Art Gallery, Leeds (3)  
 British Council, London (2)  
 Imperial War Museum, London (3)  
 London Museum (1)  
 Tate Gallery, London (8)  
 City Art Gallery, Manchester (3)  
 Rutherford Loan Scheme, Manchester (1)  
 Graves Art Gallery, Sheffield (1)  
 City Art Gallery, Wakefield (2)

Abroad: None

## Bibliography

\*Section 1 (Archives) summarises the contents of the archival collections consulted during the preparation of this thesis.

\*Section 2 (Employment of Artists in Wartime) corresponds roughly to Chapters 1 and 2 of the thesis. It includes information on employment and unemployment, salaries, art education, conscription and exemption, and the various groups and projects active in dealing with the welfare of artists during the Second World War.

\*Section 3 (Contemporary Art) lists general studies of contemporary art useful for an overview of the milieu within which the WAAC operated.

\*Section 4 (MoI and WAAC) includes documentation of the organisation and functions of the Ministry of Information that is important for a clear understanding of the WAAC, as well as documentation concerned specifically with the Committee itself.

\*Section 5 (Artists) consists of books, articles, essays, theses, archives and miscellaneous sources that have provided particularly useful information on the wartime careers of artists whose work was bought or commissioned by the WAAC.

\*Section 6 (Exhibitions) is comprised entirely of reviews of exhibitions of WAAC art. Reviews appearing in news-

papers and magazines such as Flight, (i.e., publications devoted to very specific subjects) have generally been omitted, as they usually deal only with pictures and sculptures that are concerned with one theme. Analogously, reviews in provincial newspapers have been omitted if they focus primarily on the work of artists associated with the town, city or county where the newspaper was published, or if they are reprintings or summaries of reviews published elsewhere.

\*Section 7 (Miscellaneous Sources) consists principally of writings useful for background information on the social, economic, political and philosophical tenor of the times.



\*SECTION 1: Archives.

(1) Department of Art, Imperial War Museum: WAAC Archive.

This is the largest, though not the only, extant WAAC archive, and includes several hundred administrative files compiled by the Committee. Most files prefaced "GP/55" hold correspondence with, and other documents concerning, individual artists whose work was acquired by the WAAC. "GP/55" files in which the identification number is followed by an alphabet reference (e.g., "GP/55/Ho-Hu") hold correspondence with artists who applied to the WAAC, but whose work was not included in the war art collection; the alphabet references refer to the artists' surnames. Listed below are the full names of general subject files that are cited in endnotes in this thesis, where they are identified only by their GP code numbers. GP/55 files are not included; nor are other files used in the research process but not named in the endnotes.

GP/46(A) & (B) - Employment of Artists to Record the War

GP/46/9 - Scottish Artists

GP/46/10(A) & (B) - Contracts, Copyright and the Issue of Reproductions

GP/46/10 - Copyright, etc.

GP/46/10/2 - Lithographs [and Etchings] of Works by Hartrick, Gabain and Freeth

GP/46/10/5 - Contracts, Copyright and the Issue of Reproductions: "The Sunday Times"

GP/46/17 - Co-operation with the Royal Fine Arts Commission

GP/46/19 - Suggestions by Lady Norman

- GP/46/20 - Proposal by the WAAC that a Monthly Periodical Should be Issued
- GP/46/22 - Women's Activities
- GP/46/24/4/B - Proposal to Exhibit War Artists' Work in New York
- GP/46/24/13 - Second Selection of Official War Pictures to be Circulated by British Institute of Adult Education
- GP/46/24/17 - Exhibition of Official War Pictures in South Africa
- GP/46/24/20 - Exhibition of Official Pictures in South Africa
- GP/46/27 - Use of Artists' Work on Christmas Cards
- GP/46/27/1 - Use of Artists' Work on Christmas Cards: Royalties Due from Brownlee & Co.
- GP/46/27/3 - Reproduction of War Artists' Work by Raphael Tuck and Sons, Ltd.
- GP/46/27/4 - Christmas Cards: Mr. Valentine
- GP/46/27/5 - War Artists' Work for Use on Book Markers
- GP/46/31 - Application of Mr. Frank A. Wootton
- GP/46/33 - Brownlee Printing Co. Ltd.: Postcards
- GP/46/36 - Issue of Reproductions Through Penguin Books
- GP/46/38 - Loan[s] of Pictures to Scotland
- GP/46/39 - Requests for the Loan of War Artists' Pictures
- GP/46/40 - Facilities for the Royal Academy
- GP/46/41 - Inquiry by Keeper of Privy Purse
- GP/46/42 - Reproduction of Works as Calendars by the Royal Bank of Canada
- GP/46/43(A) - Sale of Photographs for Colour Reproductions, and Black & White
- GP/46/45 - Loan of Pictures to War Weapons Weeks

- GP/46/46 - Applications from Would-be Purchasers of Work
- GP/46/48 - Application from Director of Tate Gallery
- GP/46/50 - Reproduction of War Artists' Pictures for Canteens
- GP/46/52 - War Pictures for Canada
- GP/46/57 - Reproduction of Eric Kennington's Work
- GP/46/60 - Publicity for War Artists' Work
- GP/46/62 - Exhibition in West Indies
- GP/46/64 - Reproduction of Works as Calendars by the Copp Clark Co.
- GP/46/67 - Loan of Official War Pictures to No.11 Downing Street
- GP/46/69 - Photographs of Official War Pictures to be Sent to South Africa
- GP/46/71 - Firemen's Exhibition in the Dominions
- GP/46/78 - Exhibition of War Artists' Work in Schools
- GP/46/78/1 - Exhibition of Work in Schools. Circulation
- GP/46/79 - Pictures on Loan to the Air Ministry
- GP/46/80 - Pictures on Loan to the War Office
- GP/46/81 - Sculptors
- GP/46/81/1 - Sculptors. Display of Sculpture in London
- GP/46/84 - Exhibition of War Artists' Work in U.S.S.R.
- GP/46/94 - Exhibition of Eric Kennington's Pictures in U.S.A.
- GP/46/96 - Appointment of Artists for Agricultural Subjects
- GP/46/98 - One-man Exhibition of Capt. Gross' Paintings of the Italian Army and Burmese Frontier at Request of India Office
- GP/46/99 - Specimen Letters in Connection with Artists' Work
- GP/46/100 - Ministry of Home Security Scheme for Artists in the Directorate of Camouflage

- GP/46/102 - B.B.C.
- GP/46/105 - Loans to C.I.A.D. for R.A.F. and Army Educational Schemes
- GP/46/106 - Hubert Wellington
- GP/46/109 - Proposal to Hold Exhibition in South Africa (British War Paintings)
- GP/46/110 - Suggestions and Requests for Postwar Disposal of Pictures
- GP/46/116 - Imperial War Museum (Temporary File)
- GP/46/119 - Contacts in Australia: Broken Hill Museum and Art Gallery
- GP/46/123 - Liberated France. Presentation of War Artists' Paintings to French Ambassador
  
- GP/51/4 - Facilities for Artists to Work in Prohibited Areas. Permits for Artists Working Independently
- GP/51/5 - Facilities for Artists to Work in Prohibited Areas. "War Artists and Illustrators"
  
- GP/72/A - WAAC Agendas and Minutes, 1939-17 February 1940 (two bound volumes)
- GP/72/B - WAAC Agendas and Minutes, 18 February-18 March 1940 (bound volume)
- GP/72/C - WAAC Agendas and Minutes, 19 March-29 June 1940 (two bound volumes)
- GP/72/D(1) - WAAC Agendas and Minutes, 3 July-20 November 1940 (bound volume)
- GP/72/D(2) - WAAC Agendas and Minutes, 21 November 1940-7 February 1941 (bound volume)
- GP/72/E(1) - WAAC Agendas and Minutes, 12 February-12 July 1941 (bound volume)
- GP/72/E(2) - WAAC Agendas and Minutes, 16 July-11 December 1941 (bound volume)
- GP/72/F - WAAC Agendas and Minutes, 1 December 1941-30 September 1942 (bound volume)

- GP/72/G(1) - WAAC Agendas and Minutes, 1 October 1942-28 February 1943 (bound volume)
- GP/72/G(2) - WAAC Agendas and Minutes, 1 March-27 October 1943 (bound volume)
- GP/72/H(1) - WAAC Agendas and Minutes, 3 November 1943-31 August 1944 (bound volume)
- GP/72/H(2) - WAAC Agendas and Minutes, 1 September 1944-30 June 1945 (bound volume)
- GP/72/H(3) - WAAC Agendas and Minutes, 1 July 1945-30 July 1947 (bound volume)
  
- GP/99 - Application from Periodicals for Permission to Reproduce Work of War Artists. General
- GP/99/1 - Application from Periodicals for Permission to Reproduce Work of War Artists. Home
- GP/99/2 - Applications from Periodicals for Permission to Reproduce Work of War Artists. Empire
- GP/99/3 - Applications from Periodicals for Permission to Reproduce Work of War Artists. U.S.A.

(2) Imperial War Museum: Miscellaneous

The Department of Documents has a collection of letters written by Edward Bawden to his parents and wife while he was in the Middle East as a war artist, the Department of Art has a manuscript dealing with Carel Weight as a war artist, and the Department of Sound Records has a collection of tape-recorded interviews with war artists (see below, Section 4; interviews with other figures are noted in the present Section). The Museum's Central Files include papers from the IWM subcommittee charged with finishing the WAAC's work in 1946, and the Department of Art has miscellaneous manuscripts and collections. Especially useful are:

Imperial War Museum. Government Departments (Central File #B6/3).

----- . Government Departments (Central File #B6/4).

----- . Press Cuttings, 1937-1957 (scrapbook).

-----: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: R.C. Ball (tape-recorded interview; accession #614/04).

-----: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Lord Clark, OM, CH, KCB, C Lit, FBA (tape-recorded interview; accession #4778/02).

-----: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Terence Frost (tape-recorded interview; accession #961/03).

-----: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: William Scott (tape-recorded interview; accession #4831/03).

Mayes, Philip. "The Origins of an Art Collection" (manuscript; Department of Art).

Ministry of Information. [Scrapbook of correspondence, docu-

ments and press clippings concerning the MoI Studio Division; compiled by E.J. Embleton] (Department of Art).

(3) Public Records Office, Kew

A rich source of documentation on a variety of subjects, including the organisation of the Ministry of Information, the employment of artists as teachers and as camoufleurs during the War, and the interest of government Ministries and the Armed Services in engaging war artists:

Admiralty. Portraits of Naval Personnel: Request from MoI for Mr. E. Kennington and Mr. Roberts to Paint Portraits (ADM 1/10347).

----- Portraits of Sailors Distinguishing Themselves During the War: Treasury Approval of £500 Per Annum (ADM 1/11494).

----- Official Admiralty War Artist: Appointment of Sir Muirhead Bone (ADM 1/11806).

Air Ministry. Meetings Held in 1939-40 to Consider the Collection and Assembly of Historical Material for Museum Purposes (AIR 20/6286).

Board of Education. Further Education: Art School Files (ED 83).

----- Further Education: Major Art Establishments (ED 167).

----- Technical Education: ... Art etc., 1944-1945 (ED 138/88).

Board of Trade. E.M.O'R. Dickey, Art Inspector - Board of Education. Evidence on Primary and Secondary Schools (BT 57/3 A.50).

----- Industrial Art Committee: F[ederation of] B[ritish] I[ndustries]. Employment Bureau for Industrial Designers (BT 57/14 A.228).

----- Fifth General Report on the Work of the Council [for Art and Industry] (BT 57/26 A.502).

----- [Council for Art and Industry] Royal College of Art Committee (BT 57/8 A.136).



British Council. Fine Arts Committee. Minutes - General Committee 1935-1945 (BW 67/5).

-----. Secretariat - Miscellaneous - British Council and MoI: Division of Responsibilities. 1939- 1940 (BW 82/7).

-----. British Council - Foreign Propaganda (BW 2/84).

-----. British Cultural Propaganda in the West Indies (BW 2/89).

-----. The Chairman and Secretary General, 1936-1946 (BW 2/357)

-----. Ministry of Information (BW 2/362).

-----. British Council War Time Role (BW 2/363).

-----. Permanent War Artists Collection. Pictures (BW 2/405).

-----. Fine Arts Committee. Minutes - General Committee, 1939-1945 (BW 67/5).

-----. Secretariat - Miscellaneous - British Council and Ministry of Information: Division of Responsibilities, 1939-1940 (BW 82/7).

Ministry of Home Security. Camouflage Advisory Panel. Minutes of Meetings (HO 186/171).

-----. Publicity Exhibitions. Civil Defence Art Exhibition. London (HO 186/576).

-----. Employment of Official Artists. Portraits of Civil Defence Personnel. Alderman Halliwell (HO 186/587).

-----. Employment of Official Artists. Special Facilities for Royal Academicians (HO 186/879).

-----. Employment of Official Artists. Portraits of Civil Defence Personnel (HO 186/1209).

-----. Official Artists. Employment of Camouflage Artists (HO 186/1648).

-----. Employment of Official Artists. Portraits of Fire Guards (HO 186/1649).

-----. Publicity Exhibitions. Civil Defence Art Exhibitions: London (HO 186/1661).

- . Camouflage Committee: Constitution and Appointments. Camouflage Assessment Committee, Camouflage Technical Subcommittee: Memoranda, including Organisation of Development, Design and Execution of Camouflage (HO 186/1985).
- . Camouflage Committee... (HO 186/1987).
- . Civil Camouflage. Historical Review of Policy, Organisation and Committees (HO 186/1989).
- . Employment of Official Artists. General Arrangements (HO 186/2235).
- . Research and Experiments Department. Camouflage of Vital Factories and Key Points, 1939 to 1945 (HO 191/3).
- Ministry of Information. Progress Report, April 1940 (INF 1/4).
- . Progress Report. May 1940 (INF 1/5).
- . Progress Reports. From Outbreak of War to October 1939 (INF 1/6).
- . Functions and Organisation of the Ministry (INF 1/8).
- . Functions and Organisation of the Ministry (INF 1/10).
- . Staff Organisation. General Questions (INF 1/23).
- . Re-organisation of the Ministry Staff: Group III: Publicity Producers: Literature and Art Division (INF 1/32).
- . Staff Organisation: Editorial Section (INF 1/39).
- . Organisation of the MoI: Sept. 1940. General Production Division. Art Contracts Outside the Ministry (INF 1/87).
- . Reorganisation of MoI Photographs Division (INF 1/103).
- . Organisation of the Ministry Publications Division. Appointment re: Handling of Reproductions of War Artists' Work (INF 1/124).
- . Organisation of the Ministry of Information: September 1940. Cartoon Service (INF 1/134).

- . Re-organisation of the Ministry of Information. Official Artists Section (INF 1/143).
- . Photography Censorship (INF 1/180).
- . Organisation of the Ministry Publications Division. Appointment re Handling of Reproductions of War Artists' Work (INF 1/124).
- . MoI: Committee on Authors (INF 1/229).
- . Central Institute of Art and Design (INF 1/232).
- . CIAD. Proposed Exhibition of Portraits of Members of the Fighting Forces (INF 1/233).
- . Publicity by Means of a Pictorial Publication. "Picture Post" (INF 1/234).
- . Ministry Magazines. Policy (INF 1/246B).
- . Planning Committee - Minutes of Occasional Meetings, and Reports (INF 1/250).
- . Home Morale Emergency Committee (memoranda and reports) (INF 1/254).
- . Home Morale. Entertainment and Education During the Winter 1940-1941 (INF 1/260).
- . Censorship Defence Notices. Censorship Arrangements with Government Departments: The Admiralty (INF 1/529).
- . Film History of the War. May 1941-September 1945 (INF 1/626)
- . Contracts with Artists. Dame Laura Knight, October 1939-August 1940 (INF 1/637).
- . Contracts with Artists. War Artist[s] and Illustrators. 24 November 1939-October 1941 (INF 1/638).
- . Contracts with Artists. G.W. Harrington. February 1940-March 1942 (INF 1/639).
- . Contracts with Artists. Commissioning of Portrait of Prime Minister. August 1942-April 1943 (INF 1/640).
- . Postcards for Propaganda Purposes. Counter Propaganda Postcards. Creative Production. February 1941-April 1942 (INF 1/646).

- . Postcards for Propaganda Purposes. Counter Propaganda, May 1941-April 1942 (INF 1/647).
- . Postcards for Propaganda Purposes. Counter Propaganda. C.P. Departmental Minutes (INF 1/648).
- . Postcards for Propaganda Purposes. Free French Postcards, September-December 1941 (INF 1/650).
- . General Procedure Regarding the Issue of Permits to Take Photos. Revision of Control of Photography Order (INF 1/706).
- . International Propaganda and Broadcasting Inquiry. "Memorandum [to MoI] by the International Propaganda and Broadcasting Inquiry" (21 June 1939) (INF 1/724).
- . [Original paintings and drawings produced for, and retained by, the MoI for propaganda and publicity purposes between 1939 and 1946] (INF 3).
- Ministry of Production. Paints and Pigments (T 246/124).
- Ministry of Reconstruction. Committee on Reconstruction Problems. Dartington Hall. Survey of Education in the Arts (CAB 124.425).
- . Central Institute of Art and Design. Reconstruction of Arts and Crafts (CAB 124.426).
- Ministry of Supply. History of the Ministry of Supply, 1942-1945 (AVIA 12/23).
- . Responsibilities of Ministry of Supply. Pre-Merger, 1941-1945 (AVIA 12/26).
- Treasury. Royal Academy of Arts (T 161/1002).

(4) Bankside Gallery Archive (London)

Holds record books from several art organisations, several of which are helpful in estimating the effects the War had on such organisations and their members.

Central Institute of Art and Design. [Papers on proposals for the employment of artists in post-war reconstruction, and some newspaper clippings] (Imperial Arts League box).

Imperial Arts League. Minute Book, 7 February 1935-8 January 1948.

Old Water Colour Society's Club. Minute Book, 8 May 1923-15 February 1961.

Print Collectors' Club. Specimens of Printing.

Royal Society of Painter-Etchers and Engravers. Minute Book, 1918-1954.

------. [Records of attendance and sales at annual exhibitions, 1934-1950].

------. Reports of the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting [and miscellaneous papers], 1903-1953.

Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours. Council Minute Book, 5 January 1921-12 June 1946.

------. Exhibitions: Volume 5 (1929-195-).

------. Journal [Sales, 1915-1944].

------. [Journal] [Sales, 1915-1919, 1945-1957].

------. Minute Book, 30 November 1942-[present].

Royal Water Colour Society Art Club. Minute Book, 26 March 1934-1984.

(5) National Gallery Archive

The collection includes a few WAAC and CIAD records, and a number of documents produced by the Committee on the Employment of Artists in War-time:

Central Institute of Art and Design. Central Institute, 1939 (correspondence).

----- . Central Institute, 1940-1947 (correspondence).

Ministry of Information. Miscellaneous Wartime I, 1939 (correspondence).

----- . Ministry of Information Artists Advisory Committee, 1939 (correspondence).

Ministry of Labour. Committee on the Employment of Artists in War-time. Central Register of Artists in Wartime, 1939 (correspondence).

(6) National Union of Teachers Archive (London)

Holds copies of Board of Education circulars providing information on the conscription of teachers, including art teachers, and miscellaneous related subjects:

Board of Education. "Circular #1466: Teachers and National Service" (21 February 1939).

-----". "Circular #1470: Men Teachers and National Service" (1 June 1939).

-----". "Circular #1511: Teachers and National Service" (31 May 1940).

-----". "Circular #1526: Evening Classes. Winter Session 1940/41" (24 September 1940).

-----". "Circular #1545: Teachers and National Service" (9 April 1941).

-----". "Circular #1589: The Reservation of Men Teachers Admitted to Training Colleges in 1941 and 1942 Under Certain Ages" (3 June 1942).

-----". "Circular #1592: Women Students Training for the Teaching Profession or for Youth Service" (25 June 1942).

-----". "Circular #1602: Registration of Persons with Teaching Qualifications" (17 August 1942).

-----". "Circular #1619: Teachers and the War Effort" (19 February 1943).

-----". "Circular #1621: The Reservation of Men Students Admitted to Training Colleges in 1941, 1942 and 1943" (15 February 1943).

-----". "Circular #1646: Students Training for Teaching or Youth Service" (22 February 1944).

(7) Royal Academy Archive

Aside from miscellaneous comments about the Academy's efforts to cope with wartime life, the Archive also holds some correspondence on the selection of war artists, and the availability of art materials.

Royal Academy of Arts. [Correspondence between Stafford Cripps and William Lamb about art supplies; 1947].

------. [Correspondence between Harold Macmillan and Edwin Lutyens, 1939-1940] (RAC 5/86, RAC 5/89).

------. Minute Book, 2 March 1937-9 May 1944.

------. Minute Book, 23 May 1944-23 January 1952.



(6) Tate Gallery Archive

In addition to papers and tape-recordings regarding such artists as David Bomberg, Paul Nash, C.R.W. Nevinson and Stanley Spencer (see below, Section 5), the Tate Archive also holds documentation from the Artists' International Association. The following items have been particularly useful:

AIA. "Memorandum on Use of Artists in Planning Post-war Reconstruction and in Decorating Buildings for War Purposes" (typescript, by Richard Carline; n.d.) (AIA 7043.2.53).

------. [Correspondence and notes for the 1943 lecture series The Artist and the War] (AIA: 7043.2).

(7) Tom Harrisson Mass-Observation Archive (University of Sussex)

Contains a few typescripts and handwritten notes, by Mass Observers, on war art, as well as several reports that are useful for gauging public attitudes towards leisure, and the effect of the War on the arts:

Mass-Observation. "Impact of the War on Art and the Artist: First Four Months of the War" (15 January 1940).

------. [Notes on art exhibitions visited by Mass-Observation representatives, 1938-1939] (Box Art 1).

------. [Notes on art exhibitions visited by Mass-Observation representatives, 1940] (Box Art 2).

------. [Notes on art exhibitions visited by Mass-Observation representatives, 1941-1949] (Box Art 3).

------. "File Report #24: The Cinema in the First Three Months of War" (January 1940).

------. "File Report #55: Building" (March 1940).

------. "File Report #46: Book Reading in War Time" (March 1940).

------. "File Report #47: Wartime Reading" (March 1940).

------. "File Report #48: Selection and Taste in Book Reading, January-February 1940" (March 1940).

------. File Report #49: "Gramophone Records. Sale of Records" (March 1940).

------. "File Report #57: Film Report" (February 1940).

------. "File Report #69: Theatre" (April 1940).

------. "File Report #290, Part III : Women in Wartime" (July 1940).

------. "File Report #337: Leisure Report" (August 1940).

------. "File Report #367: Leisure Report" (August 1940).

- ". "File Report #394: Mass Observation Film Work" (September 1940).
- ". "File Report #445: Film Questionnaire" (October 1945).
- ". "File Report #475: Worcester" (October 1940).
- ". "File Report #510: The War in M-O Diaries. Nov. 7-14, 1940" (December 1940). chive).
- ". "File Report #606: Second Portsmouth Report" (March 1941).
- ". "File Report #653: Use of Leisure in the R.A.F." (April 1941).
- ". "File Report #689: Comparative Report March 1940-1941" (May 1941).
- ". "File Report #871: Report on Government Exhibitions" (October 1941, April 1942).
- ". "File Report #1138: Music" (March 1942).
- ". "File Report #1222: Book Reading Survey. Interim Report, March-April 1942" (August 1942).
- ". "File Report #1378-1379: War Photographs Exhibition" (August 1942).
- ". "File Report #1380: War Themes in Entertainment" (August 1942).
- ". "File Report #1498: Blaina: Study of a Coal Mining Town, With a Brief Introduction by Leonard Woolf" (1942).
- ". "File Report #1632: Some Notes on the Use of Leisure" (March 1943).
- ". "File Report #2230: Report on RAF Exhibition at Dorland Hall" (April 1945).
- ". "File Report #2361: Report on Modern Homes Exhibition" (April 1946).

Moss, Louis and Kathleen Box. The Cinema Audience: An Inquiry Made by the Wartime Social Survey for the Ministry of Information, June-July 1943 (entry #1871).

(8) Miscellaneous Archives and Documentation

Useful information on such subjects as wartime employment of artists, art schools 1939-1945, and WAAC exhibitions abroad:

Alex Reid & Lefevre, Ltd. Letter to the author from Jacqueline Cartwright, 29 May 1987.

Art Association of Montreal. File #132: Britain at War (Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal Archive).

Art Gallery of New South Wales (Sydney). Letter to the author from Kay Truelove, 29 November 1989.

Art Gallery of South Australia (Adelaide). Letter to the author from Graham Hearne (Education Officer), 11 December 1989.

Art Gallery of Toronto. Minutes Book (1941) (Art Gallery of Ontario Archive).

Australian War Memorial (Canberra). Archive file AWM.

----- Letter to the author from Sylvia Carr, 14 May 1990.

Durban Art Museum (South Africa). Letter to the author from Jill Addleson (Director), 3 November 1989.

Johannesburg Art Gallery (South Africa). Letter to the author from Jillian E. Carman (Senior Professional Officer), 7 December 1989.

Leger Galleries Ltd. Letter to the author from David W. Posnett, 18 May 1987.

Museum of Modern Art (New York) Archives. 1940's records from the Museum's Circulating Exhibitions Department.

National Art Gallery (Wellington, New Zealand). Letter to the author from Jane Vial (Research Assistant), 14 December 1989.

----- Closed National Gallery files: Alphabetical File "N".

----- Closed National Gallery files: Alphabetical File "W".

National Gallery of Canada. File #5.5-13 - Exhibitions in Gallery: Britain at War Exhibition, 1941 (NGC).

National Library of New Zealand (Wellington). Letter to the author from Jennifer Schumacher (Librarian, Drawings and Prints), 14 May 1990.

National Union of Teachers (London). Circulars, issued by the Board of Education, regarding the conscription of art teachers. See especially: #1466 (21 February 1939), #1470 (1 June 1939), #1511 (31 May 1940), #1526 (24 September 1940), #1545 (9 April 1941), #1589 (3 June 1942), #1592 (25 June 1942), #1602 (17 August 1942), #1619 (19 February 1943), #1621 (15 February 1943), and #1646 (22 February 1944).

Royal Academy of Art. [Correspondence between Harold Macmillan and Edwin Lutyens, 1939-1940] (RAC 5/86, RAC 5/89).

----- . Minute Book, 2 March 1937-9 May 1944.

----- . Minute Book, 23 May 1944-23 January 1952.

Royal College of Art. "Council of the Royal College of Art. Report" (series, covering sessions 1938-1939 to 1945-1946; none found for 1939-1940 and 1944-1945. Type-scripts; Royal College of Art Archive.)

Slade School of Fine Art. Letter to the author from Murray Watson (Secretary to the Slade), 7 July 1987.

\*SECTION 2: Employment of Artists in Wartime - Published Materials, and Theses.

1921 Census of England and Wales (London: HMSO, 1924).

1931 Census of England and Wales (London: HMSO, 1934).

1931 Census of Scotland (Edinburgh: HMSO, 1934).

1951 Census of England and Wales (London: HMSO, 1956).

Agnew, Geoffrey. Agnew's, 1817-1967 (London: The Bradbury Agnew Press Ltd., 1967).

Anonymous. "Artist Puts Punch into Picture Propaganda," World's Press News and Advertisers' Review; Advertising World supplement (12 June 1941), p.3.

-----". "Artists and National Service," Imperial Arts League Bulletin, #9 (August 1939), pp.148-149.

-----". "Artists and the War," Country Life, 86 (25 November 1939), p.538.

-----". "Artists and War Service," Studio, 119 #566 (May 1940), p.153.

-----". "Beautifully Less," Times (5 April 1940), p.9.

-----". "Buying a Picture," Times (12 August 1943), p.5.

-----". "Carrying On," Studio, 118 #560 (November 1939), pp.216-217.

-----". "The Central Institute of Art and Design," Art & Industry, 32 (1942), pp.101-103.

-----". "Entertainment and Culture: Aims of the New [Art and Entertainment Emergency] Council," Times (12 December 1939), p.6.

-----". "Evacuation," National Society of Art Masters Journal, 12 #4 (February 1940), pp.80-82.

-----". "The Londoner's England in War-time: Brewers' Scheme for Record by Artists," Times (15 July 1944), p.6.

-----". "Making Records of Famous Buildings: War Plan for Artists," National Society of Art Masters Journal, 12 #2 (December 1939), p.43.

- . "Pencil Notes," Imperial Arts League Bulletin, #9 (August 1939), pp.139-140.
- . "Royal College of Art in Lakeland: An Ambleside Broadcast," Cumberland and Westmorland Herald (26 February 1944), p.1.
- . "Students' Activities: School of Art," Polytechnic [School of Art, London] Magazine (April 1946), p.52.
- Armfield, Maxwell, Adrian Bury, Keith Henderson, Gilbert Spencer. "Carried Unanimously [letters to the Editor]," Studio, 119 #562 (January 1940), p.24.
- Art and Entertainment Emergency Council. The Arts in Wartime (brochure; [May 1940]) (Tom Harrisson Mass-Observation Archive, Box: Art 2, File: C).
- Artists' International Association. A.I.A. Bulletin. Particularly useful information on employment and other wartime concerns of artists is summarised in most copies of the Bulletin. See especially #58 (December 1939) through #86 (1945), and Emergency Bulletins #1-#3 (August-September 1939).
- . Your Work as an Artist in Wartime (brochure; 1940) (Tate: AIA 7043.17.7).
- Art Prices Current, vol.15 (1935-1936) - vol.24 (1945-1946).
- Ashwin, Clive. A Century of Art Education, 1882-1982 (London: Middlesex Polytechnic, 1982).
- Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education. Annual Report, February, 1944 (London: The Women's Printing Society, [1944]).
- . Fourth Annual Report, January 1947 (London: The Women's Printing Society, [1947]).
- Berry, Arthur. A Three and Seven Pence and Halfpenny Man (England: Kermase Foot and Books Co-op, 1986).
- Bishop, F.P. The Economics of Advertising (London: Robert Hale Limited, 1944).
- Board of Education. Royal College of Art: First Annual Report of the Council, 1937-1948 (London: HMSO, 1939).
- . Education in 1938, Being the Report of the Board of Education and the Statistics of Public Education for England and Wales (London: HMSO, 1939).

- . Prospectus of the Royal College of Art, South Kensington, London, Session 1938-1939 (London: HMSO, 1938).
- . Prospectus of the Royal College of Art, South Kensington, London, Session 1939-1940 (London: HMSO, 1938 [sic]).
- . Royal College of Art: Session 1941-42 ([London: HMSO, 1941]).
- . Teachers and Youth Leaders, Report of the Committee Appointed by the President of the Board of Education to Consider the supply, Recruitment, and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders (London: HMSO, 1944).
- . Technical and Art Education and Other Forms of Further Education (England and Wales), List of the More Important Institutions Recognised by the Board of Education (London: HMSO, 1936).
- . Burnham Committee. Third Report of the Burnham Committee Representative of Local Education Authorities and Associations of Teachers in Technical and Art Schools in Which the Local Education Authorities Accept Responsibility for Salary Scales, England and Wales, July, 1938 (London: HMSO, 1939)..
- . Burnham Committee. Fourth Report of the Burnham Committee on Scales of Salaries for Teachers in Public Elementary Schools, England and Wales, October, 1938 (London: HMSO, 1939).
- . Burnham Committee. Report of the Burnham Committee on Scales of Salaries for Teachers in Primary and Secondary Schools, England and Wales, August 1945 (London: HMSO, 1945).
- . Burnham Committee. Report of the Burnham Committee on Scales of Salaries for Teachers in Technical Colleges and Institutes, and Colleges and Schools, England and Wales, August 1945 (London: HMSO, 1945).
- . Committee on Advanced Art Education in London [Hambleton Committee]. Report (London: HMSO, 1936).
- . Consultative Committee on Secondary Education. Report With Special Reference to Grammar Schools, Technical High Schools (London: HMSO, 1938).
- Board of Trade. Committee on the Production and Exhibition of Articles of Good Design and Every-day Use, Art and Indus-



try. Report of the Committee Appointed by the Board of Trade Under the Chairmanship of Lord Gorell (London: HMSO, 1932).

------. Council for Art and Industry. Design and the Designer in Industry (London: HMSO, 1937).

------. Council for Art and Industry. Design in the Jewellery, Silversmithing and Allied Trades (London: HMSO, 1937).

------. Council for Art and Industry. Design in the Pottery Industry (London: HMSO, 1937).

------. Council for Art and Industry. Education for the Consumer. Art in Elementary and Secondary School Education (London: HMSO, 1935).

------. Council for Art and Industry. Dress Committee. Design and the Designer in the Dress Trade (London: HMSO, 1945).

[Bomberg, David]. "War Work for Artists," Times (24 May 1941), p.2.

Boswell, James. The Artist's Dilemma (series: New Developments, #1) (London: The Bodley Head, 1947).

Boswell, Peyton. "Art Booms in Britain," Art Digest, 18 #1 (1 October 1943), p.3.

Carter, Ernestine. "Letter from London," Magazine of Art, 33 #1 (January 1940), pp.33,62,64.

Cave, Roderick. The Private Press (London: Faber and Faber, 1971).

Central Institute of Art and Design. Bulletin. Like the Artists' International Association's Bulletin (see above), the Bulletin of the CIAD is a good source of summarised information about wartime projects for the employment of artists. See especially the ten issues from Volume 1 #1 to Volume 10 #10 (31 December 1940 to September 1945).

------. Report on Nine Years' Work of the Central Institute of Art and Design (London: The Euston Press, [1948?]).

Central Statistical Office. Statistical Abstract from the United Kingdom in Each of the Fifteen Years, 1924 to 1938. Eighty-third Number (London: HMSO, 1940).

------. Statistics Relating to Education for Years 1935-

1946 (London: HMSO, 1948).

Clark, Kenneth. "Artists in War: A Central Institute [letter to the Editor]," Times (21 October 1939), p.4.

Constantine, Stephen. Social Conditions in Britain, 1918-1939 (London/New York: Methuen, 1983).

------. Unemployment in Britain Between the Wars (London: Longman Group Ltd, 1980).

Darracott, Joseph, and Belinda Loftus. Second World War Posters (London: Imperial War Museum, 1972).

Davison, Ronald Conway. British Unemployment Policy. The Modern Phase Since 1930 (London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1938).

Dodd, A.W. "The Artist in War [letter to the Editor]," Spectator, 163 #508 (28 March 1941), p.508.

Dove Cottage and Wordsworth Museum. The Artist as Evacuee: The Royal College of Art in the Lake District, 1940-1945 (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: The Wordsworth Trust, 1987).

Dugdale, T.C, W. Russell Flint and John A. Milne, "Creative Art in War-time: Planning for the Future [letter to the Editor]," Sunday Times (15 October 1939), p.10.

Dunlop, R.O., "Buying Pictures [letter to the Editor]," Times (27 July 1940), p.5.

Edinger, George. "Everybody Wants to Buy a Picture: There Are Not Enough Artists to Paint Them," Daily Mail (24 April 1943), p.2.

Esher, Lionel. "The Plot to Save Artists," Times Literary Supplement, #4370 (2 January 1987), pp.12-13.

Evans, L.A.M. "It Must Go On!," National Society of Art Masters Journal, 12 #5 (March 1940), pp.101-104.

Farthing, Cecil. "The National Buildings Record," Museums Journal, 43 #1 (April 1943), pp.3-6.

Fell, H. Granville. "The Connoisseur in War Time: The Arts and Antique Dealers," Connoisseur, 104 #459 (November 1939), pp.255-259.

Flint, W. Russell. "The Arts in Wartime [letter to the Editor]," Times (15 September 1939), p.3.

- Forge, Andrew. "The Slade, Part 2: To the Present Day," Motif (Spring 1961), pp.42-65.
- Fox, Mrs. S.M. "Artists in War-time [letter to the Editor]," Times (19 February 1940), p.4.
- Franklin, Colin. The Private Presses (London: Studio Vista, 1969).
- Frayling, Christopher. The Royal College of Art: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Art and Design (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1987).
- Freeman, Julian. Made at the Slade: A Survey of Mature Works by Ex-students of the Slade School of Fine Art, 1892-1960 (Brighton: Brighton Polytechnic. Faculty of Art and Design, 1979).
- Furst, Herbert. "A Defence of the Philistine," Apollo, 41 (1945), pp.22-24.
- Gardiner, Gerald. "War Bonus," National Society of Art Masters Journal, 13 #5 (October 1941), pp.137-141.
- Garrett, Albert. British Wood Engraving of the 20th Century: A Personal View (London: Scolar Press, 1980).
- Geffrye Museum. CC41: Utility Furniture and Fashion 1941-1951 (London: Inner London Education Authority, 1974).
- Gilmour, Pat. Artists at Curwen: A Celebration of the Gift of Artists' Prints from the Curwen Studio (London: Tate Gallery, 1977).
- Gloag, John. "Shop Windows and the Blackout," Listener, 23 #575 (18 January 1940), pp.114-115.
- Gordon, Cora. "London Commentary," Studio, 129 #623 (February 1945), pp.56-59.
- Gordon, Jan. "Art and Artists: Plans for 1940," Observer (31 December 1939), p.2.
- Grainger, John. "War Work for Museums," Museums Journal, 41 #1 (April 1941), pp.1-3.
- Gray, Milner, John Gloag, Betty Prentis and Tom Purvis. "The Artist's Function in Time of War," Art & Industry (1939), pp.197-200.
- Hartcup, Guy. Camouflage: A History of Concealment and Deception in War (Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1979).

- Heald, Samuel. "The Artist in War [letter to the Editor]," Spectator, 163 #413 (22 September 1939), p.413.
- Herring, Robert. "Editorial," Life and Letters To-Day, 25 #32 (April 1940), pp.1-3.
- Hill, Adrian. "Art and the Army," Studio 128 #617 (August 1944), pp.55-57.
- Hill, Oliver. "Mural Paintings in War Canteens and British Restaurants," Studio 126 #608 (November 1943), pp.137-147.
- Hodgson, Pat. The War Illustrators (London: Osprey, 1977).
- Hodnett, Edward. Five Centuries of English Book Illustration (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1988).
- Holme, Geoffrey. "Art and the Church," Studio 119 #563 (February 1940), p.33.
- . "Artists and War Service," Studio 119 #566 (May 1940), p.153.
- . "The Buyer's Market," Studio, 119 #562 (January 1940), p.1.
- . "The Nation and the Artist," Studio 119 #567 (June 1940), p.193.
- Hubbard, Hesketh. "The Arts in War-time [letter to the Editor]," Times (20 September 1939), p.4.
- Ince, Godfrey H. The Ministry of Labour and National Service (series: The New Whitehall Series, ed. Sir Robert Fraser) (London/New York: George Allen & Unwin/Oxford University Press, 1960).
- . Mobilisation of Man-Power in Great Britain for the Second Great War (Manchester: Norbury, Lockwood & Co. Ltd, 1945).
- Johansen, Waldemar. "Military Uses of Art," School Arts Magazine, 43 #1 (September 1943), p.28.
- Kaldor, Nicholas, and Rodney Silverman. A Statistical Analysis of Advertising Expenditure and of the Revenue of the Press (series: National Institute of Economic and Social Research, Economic and Social Studies) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948).

Lawrence, Lesley, "Contemporary Art: Exhibitions and Schools," Times (7 October 1939), p.4.

Lay-Figure. "Round the Artists' Studios," Artist, 22 #5 (January 1942), p.112.

London County Council. Camberwell School of Arts and Crafts: Jubilee, 1898-1948 (London: London County Council, 1949).

Macmillan, Harold. "War-time Support for the Arts: The Pilgrim Trust Grant; Plans for the Immediate Future [letter to the Editor]," Times (25 January 1940), p.7.

Mass-Observation. "What Painters are Painting and Selling," Us, #3 (17 February 1940), p.8.

McGreevy, Thomas. "In the World's Art Centres: London," Studio, 118 (1939), pp.256-257.

----- . "In the World's Art Centres: London," Studio, 119 #562 (January 1940), pp.25-26.

McLeish, Minnie. "Decentralisation and Art Education [in 11 parts]," Studio 119 #563 (February 1940), pp.44-47; 119 #564 (March 1940), pp.90-93; 119 #565 (April 1940), pp.121-123; 119 #566 (May 1940), pp.170-173; 119 #567 (June 1940), pp.206-208; 120 #568 (July 1940), pp.19-21; 120 #573 (December 1940), pp.196-197; 121 #574 (January 1941), pp.12-15; 121 #575 (February 1941), pp.56-58; 121 #576 (March 1941), pp.82-83; 121 #577 (April 1941), pp.106-107.

Ministry of Education. Education in 1947. Being the Report of the Ministry of Education and the Statistics of Public Education for England and Wales (London: HMSO, 1948).

----- . Abridged Prospectus of the Royal College of Art, South Kensington, London (London: HMSO, 1945).

----- . Prospectus of the Royal College of Art, South Kensington, London: Session 1946-7 (London: HMSO, 1946).

Ministry of Labour. Summary of Unemployment Insurance Acts, 1920-1934 (London: HMSO, 1934).

Mortimer, Raymond. "First Aid for the Artist," New Statesman and Nation, 18 #440 (29 July 1939), pp.175-176.

----- . "Tragic Painters," New Statesman and Nation, 15 #382 (18 June 1938), pp.1026-1027.

Nash, Paul. "Letter from Oxford," Listener, 22 #568 (30 No-

vember 1939), pp.1065-1067.

National Register of Industrial Art Designers. Annual Report, Statement of Accounts and Balance Sheet for the Year 1938-39, Submitted to the Annual General Meeting on July 25th 1939 (England: The Euston Press, 1939).

Newton, Eric. "The Sacred Square Mile," New Statesman and Nation, 21 #540 (28 June 1941), p.650.

One of Them. "The Liquidation of the Free-lances," New Statesman and Nation, 19 #478 (20 April 1940), pp.526-527.

Palmer, Arnold, ed. Recording Britain (England: Oxford University Press (Geoffrey Cumberlege, Publisher to the University), in association with the Pilgrim Trust, 1946-1949) (4 volumes).

Pevsner, Nikolaus. An Enquiry Into Industrial Art in England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937).

Piper, John. "Records of Changing Britain at the National Gallery [Recording Britain exhibition]," Britain To-day #60 (22 August 1941), pp.9-12.

Reitlinger, Gerald. The Economics of Taste. Volume I: The Rise and Fall of Picture Prices, 1760-1960 (London: Barrie & Rockliff, 1961).

Robertson, C. "London Art Schools [letter to the Editor]," Times (25 October 1939), p.6.

Rothenstein, Michael. "'Can We Be Educated Up to Art?': Notes on Lecturing to the Army," Horizon, 7 #40 (April 1943), pp.270-277.

Salmond, James B, ed. Recording Scotland (Edinburgh/London: Oliver and Boyd, for the Pilgrim Trust, 1952).

Sawkins, Harold. "Art Thrives Exceedingly in War-time," Artist, 28 #1 (September 1944), p.145.

Scottish Education Department. Teachers. Supply, Recruitment and Training in the Period Immediately Following the War (Edinburgh: HMSO, 1944).

Select Committee on National Expenditure. Fourteenth Report (London: HMSO, 1940). Also published in Parliamentary Papers 1939-1940, 3, pp.589-597.

Seward, M.L.E. "Evacuation - An Art Teacher's Adventures," National Society of Art Masters Journal, 12 #2 (December

1939), pp.34-36.

Smith, H. Llewellyn. "Artists in War-time: A Pictorial Record of Britain [letter to the Editor]," Times (1 February 1940), p.6.

Trevelyan, Julian. "The Technique of Camouflage," Architectural Review, 96 #573 (September 1944), pp.68-70.

Tunstall, Jeremy. The Advertising Man in London Advertising Agencies (London: Chapman & Hall Ltd, 1964).

Wallis, Neville A.D. "Art in Wartime," Journal of the Royal Society of Arts (19 April 1940), pp.539-543.

Wilenski, R.H. "What is the Future of English Painting," World Review, (New Year, 1946), pp.46-51.

Williams, Harold. "How the War Office Planned Its Posters," Poster, War Emergency Edition (October 1939), pp.19-21.

Williams, W.H., "Artists in Distress [letter to the Editor]," Times (4 October 1940), p.5.

Woodham, Jonathan. "Design and Empire: British Design in the 1920's," Art History, 3 #2 (June 1980), pp.229-240.

Woods, S. John. "Letter to a Young Artist," Our Time, 4 #6 (January 1945), pp.10-11.

\*SECTION 3: Contemporary Art - Published Material, and Theses.

Allinson, Adrian. "From the General to the Particular, Part VI," Artist, 26 #6 (February 1944), pp.123-124.

Anonymous. "Art and the Public," Times (27 November 1943), p.5.

----- "Art and War," Times (13 February 1943), p.5.

----- "Art and War," Times (26 February 1945), p.5.

----- "Art in War-time," Times (11 October 1939), p.9.

----- "The Artist and the War: Victory as a Theme," Times (8 February 1943), p.2.

----- "Artists and War Service," Studio 119 (1940), p.153.

----- "Artists in Uniform," Art & Industry, 34 (1943), pp.73-81.

----- "British Art and Life To-day," Britain To-day, #16 (8 December 1939), pp.1-4.

----- "City and Country: Art on Rural Tour," Lincolnshire Chronicle & Leader (12 July 1943), p.3.

----- "Painting and the Battle," Times (25 October 1940), p.5.

----- "Should There Be a Ministry of Fine Arts?," Studio, 125 #599 (February 1943), pp.51,59.

----- "The State and the Painter," Times (10 August 1942), p.5.

----- "Notes and News: State Patronage of Art," Art & Industry, 33 (1942), pp.116,118.

----- [Editor]. "Artists in War - and Peace," Listener, 23 #574 (11 January 1940), p.60.

----- [Editor]. "The Arts in War-time," Britain To-day #47 (21 February 1941), pp.1-3.

Artists' International Association. AIA 25: An Exhibition to Celebrate the Twenty-fifth Anniversary in 1933 of the Artists International Association (London: [AIA], 1958).



- . Exhibition of War Pictures (London: AIA, 1941).
- Arts Council of Great Britain. British Painters, 1939-1945 (Great Britain: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1946).
- . Decade '40s: Painting, Sculpture and Drawing in Britain 1940-49 (Great Britain: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1972).
- . Thirties: British Art and Design Before the War (Great Britain: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1979).
- . Welsh Committee. British Art and the Modern Movement, 1930-1940 (Wales: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1962).
- Battersby, Martin. The Decorative Thirties (London: Studio Vista, 1971).
- Beddington, Jack. "Patronage in Art - IV," Listener 14 #350 (25 September 1935), pp.527-528.
- Bell, Clive. "Art and the State. [VII]: The Failure of State Art," Listener, 16 #406 (21 October 1936), pp.745-747.
- . "A Ministry of Arts," New Statesman and Nation, 18 #451 (14 October 1939), pp.518-519.
- , Herbert Read and V.S. Pritchett. "What To Look For in a Picture," Listener, 26 #666 (16 October 1941), pp.529-530.
- Bell, Graham. "Art in the 'Island Fortress': A Review of Contemporary British Painting," Studio, 120 #571 (October 1941), pp.98-109.
- Bertram, Anthony. "Art in Service, Part 3," Studio, 143 #711 (June 1952), pp.170-177.
- Blaikley, Ernest. "Art and War: Battle Painters of the Past [letter to the Editor]," Times (17 February 1943), p.5.
- Bodkin, Thomas. "Art and War... [letter to the Editor]," Times (17 February 1943), p.5
- . "Who Cares About Art?," Listener, 23 #590 (2 May 1940), pp.875-877.
- Borzello, Frances. Civilising Caliban: The Misuse of Art 1875-1980 (London/New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987).
- Boswell, Peyton. "Studio vs. Beach-head," Art Digest, 18 #19

(1 August 1944), p.3.

British Art Centre (Stafford Gallery). This War As I See It (London: Stafford Gallery, 1940).

British Information Services. Entertainment and the Arts in Great Britain. The Story of Government Encouragement (London: [BIS], 1950).

-----, Entertainment and the Arts in Wartime Britain (London: [BIS], 1944).

Brown, Oliver. Exhibition: The Memoirs of Oliver Brown (London: Evelyn, Adams & Mackay, 1968).

Camden Arts Centre. Hampstead in the Thirties: A Committed Decade (London: Camden Arts Centre, 1975).

Carless, Richard and Patricia Brewster, Patronage and the Arts (London: Conservative Political Centre, 1959).

Carter, A.C.R, comp. The Year's Art, 1940: A Concise Epitome of All Matters Relating to the Arts of Painting, Sculpture, Engraving and Architecture, and to Schools of Design, Which Have Occurred During the Year 1939, Together with Information Respecting the Events of the Year 1940, with Full-page Illustrations (London: Hutchinson and Co (Publishers) Ltd, [1940]).

-----, comp. The Year's Art, 1941: A Concise Epitome of All Matters Relating to the Arts of Painting, Sculpture, Engraving and Architecture, and to Schools of Design, Which Have Occurred During the Year 1940, Together with Information Respecting the Events of the Year 1941, with Full-page Illustrations (London: Hutchinson and Co (Publishers) Ltd, [1941]).

-----, comp. The Year's Art, 1942-1944: A Concise Epitome of All Matters Relating to the Arts of Painting, Sculpture, Engraving and Architecture, and to Schools of Design, Which Have Occurred During the Years 1941, 1942, 1943, Together with Information Respecting the Events of the Year 1944, with Full-page Illustrations (London: Hutchinson and Co (Publishers) Ltd, [1944]).

-----, comp. The Year's Art, 1945-1947: A Concise Epitome of All Matters Relating to the Arts of Painting, Sculpture, Engraving and Architecture, and to Schools of Design, Which Have Occurred During the Years 1944, 1945, 1946, Together with Information Respecting the Events of the Year 1947, with Full-page Illustrations (London: Hutchinson and Co (Publishers) Ltd, [1947]).

- Chamot, Mary. Modern Painting in England (London/New York: Country Life Ltd/Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937).
- Clark, Kenneth. Another Part of the Wood: A Self-Portrait (London: John Murray, 1974).
- . "Art After the War," World Review ([c.1945]), pp.45-48. (Copy in Tate Gallery Archive.)
- . "Art and Democracy," Cornhill Magazine, 161 #965 (July 1945), pp.364-373.
- . "Art and Society," Cornhill Magazine, 171 #1025 (Autumn 1960), pp.307-325.
- . "Art and Society," in New York, Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art, Proceedings: The 100th Anniversary Academic Convocation of the Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art (New York: Cooper Union, 1959).
- . "Art for the People," Listener, 22 #567 (23 November 1939), pp.999-1001.
- . "The Artist in Wartime," Listener, 22 #563 (26 October 1939), p.810.
- . "Artists and War," Highway [journal of the Workers' Educational Association], 32 (December 1939), pp.32-34.
- . "The Future of Painting," Listener, 14 #351 (2 October 1935), pp.543-544.
- . The Other Half: A Self-Portrait (London: John Murray, 1977).
- . Provincialism (England: The English Association, 1962).
- Compton, Susan, ed. British Art in the 20th Century: The Modern Movement (London/Munich: Royal Academy of Arts, Prestel-Verlag, 1986).
- [Connolly, Cyril]. "Comment," Horizon, 6 #31 (July 1942), pp.2-4.
- . "Comment," Horizon, 7 #37 (January 1943), pp.4-6.
- Connolly, Cyril. "The New Medici," Architectural Review 76 #452 (July 1934), pp.2-4.

Constable, W.G. "Art and the Ordinary Man," Listener, 13 #325 (3 April 1935), pp.555-556.

Contemporary Art Society. Report (seven installments [Report 1938-1939 to Report 1944-5] in a longer-running series) (England: The Curwen Press, 1940-1946).

Cooling Galleries. [Catalogues for 20 exhibitions of work by the Civil Defence Artists] (London: Cooling Galleries, n.d.).

Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts. The Arts in War Time: A Report on the Work of C.E.M.A. 1942 & 1943 (London: CEMA, 1944).

----- . Bulletin, 1942-1945.

----- . The Fifth Year: The End of the Beginning. Report on the Work of C.E.M.A. for 1944 (London: CEMA, [1945]).

Courlander, Kathleen. "Art in the British Army," Design, 47 (March 1946), pp.5,22.

Dartington Hall Trustees. The Visual Arts: A Report Sponsored by the Dartington Hall Trustees (London/New York/Toronto: Geoffrey Cumberlege/Oxford University Press, 1946).

Davies, Peter. A Northern School: Lancashire Artists of the Twentieth Century (Bristol: Redcliffe, 1989).

Elliot, Hugh M. "A Lost Opportunity: A Service Artist's Disappointment," Art & Industry, 33 (1942), p.50.

Evans, B.I. and Mary Glasgow. The Arts in England (London: The Falcon Press, 1949).

Farr, Dennis. English Art. 1870-1940 (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1978).

Feaver, William. "Wartime Romances," Sunday Times Magazine (20 May 1973), pp.74-85.

Fell, H. Granville. "The Connoisseur in War Time: The Arts and the Antique Dealers," Connoisseur, 104 #459 (November 1939), pp.255-259.

Ferguson, John, ed. War and the Creative Arts: An Anthology (London: MacMillan, 1972).

Ford, Boris, ed. The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain. Volume 8: The Edwardian Age and the Inter-war Years (Cambridge/New Rochelle/Melbourne/Sydney: Cambridge Univer-

sity Press, 1989).

-----, ed. The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain. Volume 9: Since the Second World War (Cambridge/New York/New Rochelle/Melbourne/Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Furst, Herbert. "Creative Patronage and Its Control," Apollo, 39 (1944), pp.147-148.

"Gunner". "Artist and Soldier," Art & Industry, 33 #196 (October 1942), p.103.

Harris, John S. Government Patronage of the Arts in Great Britain (Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 1970).

Harrison, Charles. English Art and Modernism, 1900-1939 (London/Bloomington: Allen Lane/Indiana University Press, 1981).

Herbert, A.P. "The Artist in War-Time: A Bridge-Head in Whitehall? [letter to the Editor]," Times (28 October 1939), p.4.

Herring, Robert. "Editorial," Life and Letters To-day, 29 #44 (April 1941), pp.1-6.

Hinks, Roger. "Patronage in Art Today - I," Listener 14 #347 (4 September 1935), pp.385-387.

Hobson, G.D. Some Thoughts on the Organization of Art After the War (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd, [n.d.; c.1943-1945]).

Hogarth, Paul. The Artist as Reporter (London/New York: Studio Vista/Reinhold Publishing Corporation, 1967).

Honeyman, T.J. Art and Audacity (London: Collins, 1971).

Horrabin, J.F. "Art and War [letter to the Editor]," Times (19 February 1943), p.5.

Horton, Percy. "War as Inspiration to the Artist," Studio, 118 (1939), pp.226-235.

Hubbard, Hesketh. 100 Years of British Painting (London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1951).

Hutchinson, Sidney C. The History of the Royal Academy (London: Chapman & Hall, 1968).

Imperial War Museum. War History of the Imperial War Museum

(London: [HMSO?], n.d.).

Ironside, Robin. Painting Since 1939 (series: The Arts in Britain, #6) (London/New York/Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co, for the British Council, 1947).

Jameson, Storm. "Why Not a Ministry of Fine Arts," Fortnightly Review, 148 #887 (November 1940), pp.449-457.

Jeffrey, Ian and David Mellor. "Photography, 1900-1940," Studio International (July-August 1975), pp.27-34.

Johnson, Peter. Front Line Artists (London: Cassell, 1978).

Jones, Sydney R. "On Art in Wartime," Studio, 119 #562 (January 1940), pp.6-9.

Keynes, John Maynard. "Art and the State," Listener 14 #398 (26 August 1936), pp.371-374.

Knightley, Philip. The First Casualty: The War Correspondent as Hero, Propagandist, and Myth Maker from the Crimea to Vietnam (London: Andre Deutsch, 1975).

Kuspit, Donald B, "Uncivil War," Artforum, 21 #8 (April 1983), pp.34-43.

Lambert, R.S., ed. Art in England (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1938).

Lancaster, Osbert. "Modern Artists Paint for the Forces," Picture Post, 24 #5 (29 July 1944), pp.20-22.

Landau, Rom. Love for a Country: Contemplations and Conversations (London: Nicholson & Watson Limited, 1939).

Lane, James W. "Mars & Ars Britannica: England Expects Every Artist to Do His Duty," Art News, 40 (August 1941), pp.13,17,28.

Lay-Figure. "Round the Artists' Studios," Artist, 22 #4 (December 1941), p.86.

-----". "Round the Artists' Studios," Artist, 23 #6 (August 1942), p.127.

Leeper, Janet. "Art and Music in War-time," Contemporary Review, 162 #920 (August 1942), pp.98-102.

Leicester Galleries. England in Wartime: An Exhibition of Pictures by Contemporary Painters (London: Leicester Galleries, 1940).

- Lewinski, Jorge. The Camera at War: A History of War Photography from 1848 to the Present Day (Great Britain: W.H. Allen & Co. Ltd, 1978).
- Lindsay, Jack. British Achievement in Art and Music (series: Achievement Books, general ed. Noel Carrington) (London: The Pilot Press Ltd, [1945?]).
- Low, David. "The Cartoonist's Job in War," Listener, 22 #564 (2 November 1939), p.849.
- Lutyens, Edwin, John Rothenstein, Edward Marsh, Gerald Agnew, James Laver, Sydney R. Jones, A.C.R. Carter, Edward Wadsworth, Charles Tennyson. "Should There Be A Ministry of Fine Arts?," Studio 125 #599 (February 1943), pp.51,59.
- Markham, S.F. A Report on the Museums and Galleries of the British Isles (Other than the National Museums) to the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust (Dumfermline: Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, 1938).
- and E.W. Wignall. "The Museums Association War Circular No.1: Museums and the War," Museums Journal, 39 #8 (November 1939), pp.342-346.
- Marriott, Charles. "Letters to the Editor: Books, Art and War," Times Literary Supplement, #2050 (17 May 1941), p.239.
- Marsh, Edward. "Contemporary Art: Exhibitions and Schools [letter to the Editor]," Times (7 October 1939), p.4.
- . A Number of People: A Book of Reminiscences (London: William Heinemann Ltd, in association with Hamish Hamilton Ltd, 1939).
- . "Patronage in Art Today - III," Listener 14 #349 (18 September 1935), pp.487-489.
- Mathews, Joseph J. Reporting the Wars (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1957).
- Mellor, David. "British Art in the 1930s: Some Economic, Political and Cultural Structures," in Frank Gloversmith, ed., Class, Culture and Social Change: A New View of the 1930s (Sussex/New Jersey: The Harvester Press/Humanities Press Inc, 1980).
- , ed., A Paradise Lost: The Neo-Romantic Imagination in Britain, 1935-55 (London: Lund Humphries, in association with the Barbican Art Gallery, 1987).

Minihan, Janet. The Nationalization of Culture: The Development of State Subsidies to the Arts in Great Britain (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1977).

Morris, Lynda, and Robert Radford. The Story of the AIA: Artists International Association, 1939-1953 (Oxford: Museum of Modern Art, 1985).

Murry, Richard. "Picturesque Ruins," Adelphi (January-March 1942) pp.66-67.

National Gallery. The National Gallery, 1938-1954 (London: printed for the Trustees of the National Gallery, 1955).

Newton, Eric. Art for Everybody (series: Britain Advances, #7) (London/New York/Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co, for the British Council, 1943).

----- . "The Artist in the Witness Box: Eric Newton Sums Up," Listener, 23 #582 (7 March 1940), pp.480-481.

----- . British Painting (series: British Life and Thought) (London/New York/Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co, for the British Council, 1945).

----- . In My View (London/New York/Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co, 1950).

----- , and Herbert Hodge. "[The Artist in the Witness Box]: The Layman Asks Questions," Listener, 23 #581 (29 February 1940), pp.429-430.

----- and Kenneth Clark. "[The Artist in the Witness Box]: The Artist and the Patron," Listener, 23 #580 (22 February, 1940), pp.380-381.

Nicholas, J.B. "Is British Art Fighting?: A Reply to Mr. Herbert Read," Art & Industry, 33 #194 (August 1942), pp.51-52.

Pearson, Nicholas. The State and the Visual Arts: A Discussion of State Intervention in the Visual Arts in Britain (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1982).

Perspex. "Art Notes: The Stimulus of War," Apollo, 37 (1943), pp.44-45,55.

Pilgrim Trust. Annual Report (seven installments [Ninth Annual Report 1939 [1940] to Fifteenth Annual Report 1945. [1946] in a longer-running series) (London: The Univer-



sity Press, Cambridge).

Piper, Myfanwy. "Back to the Thirties," Art and Literature, #7 (Winter 1965), pp.136-162.

Polonsky, Antony. "Cultural Life in Britain During the Second World War," in Polish Academy of Sciences, Committee of Historical Studies, Institute of History, Inter arma non silent Musae: The War and Culture, 1939-1945 (Czeslaw Madajczyk, ed.) (Warsaw: Panstwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1977).

Pritchett, V.S., Graham Sutherland, Kenneth Clark and Henry Moore. "Art and Life," Listener, 26 #670 (13 November 1941), pp.657-659.

Quennell, Peter and Gail Buckland. Cecil Beaton War Photographs (London: Jane's Publishing Company Ltd for the Imperial War Museum, 1981).

Radford, Robert. Art for a Purpose: The Artists' International Association, 1933-1953 (Winchester: Winchester School of Art Press, 1987).

Ramsden, E.H. "A Critical Survey of the Work of the Younger Exhibitors," in Alex Comfort and John Bayliss, eds., New Road 1943: New Directions in European Art and Letters (Essex: The Grey Walls Press, 1943).

Read, Herbert. "Art in an Electric Atmosphere," Horizon, 3 #17 (May 1941), pp.308-313.

----- . Art in Britain 1930-40 Centred Around Axis, Circle, Unit One (London: Marlborough Fine Art Ltd./Marlborough New London Gallery, 1965).

----- . Contemporary British Art (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1951).

----- . "The Fate of Western Art," Listener, 23 #587 (11 April 1940), pp.740-741.

----- . "Is British Art Fighting? - A Reply by Herbert Read," Art & Industry, 33 #193 (July 1942), pp.2-4.

----- . To Hell With Culture (series: The Democratic Order, #4, Francis Williams, ed.) (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co, Ltd, 1941).

----- . "War and Art," Spectator, 164 #5824 (9 February 1940), pp.174-175.

- Richards, J.M., ed. The Bombed Buildings of Britain: A Record of Architectural Casualties: 1940-43 (Great Britain: The Architectural Press, 1942).
- Ridley, F.F. "Tradition, Change, and Crisis in Great Britain," in Milton C. Cummings, Jr. and Richard S. Katz, eds., The Patron State: Government and the Arts in Europe, North America, and Japan (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).
- Rothenstein, John. Brave Day Hideous Night: Autobiography, 1939-1965 (I) (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1966).
- . British Art Since 1900: An Anthology (London: Phaidon Press, [1962]).
- . Modern English Painters. Volume 2: Nash to Bawden (London/Sydney: Macdonald & Co, 1976).
- . Modern English Painters. Volume 3: Hennell to Hockney (London/Sydney: Macdonald & Co, 1976).
- . "War and the Artist," Apollo, 37 #5 (May 1943), pp.111-113.
- Royal Academy of Arts. Exhibition of Paintings by Firemen Artists (London: The Argus Press, 1941).
- . Firemen Artists: Exhibition of Paintings in Aid of the London Fire Service Benevolent Fund (London: Royal Academy, 1942).
- Russell, John. From Sickert to 1948: The Achievement of the Contemporary Art Society (London: Lund Humphries, 1948).
- Sawkins, Harold. "Art Must Carry On," Artist, 23 #4 (June 1942), p.79.
- . "Crisis in the Art World," Artist, 23 #2 (April 1942), p.27.
- Scottish Arts Council. New Painting in Glasgow, 1940-46 ([Edinburgh: Scottish Arts Council], 1968).
- Seddon, Richard. "War Art of the Past," Studio, 125 #603 (June 1943), pp.161-172.
- Settle, Peter. "Art and Entertainment: A National Service?," Our Time, 1 #5 (July 1941), pp.23-26.
- Shone, Richard. The Century of Change: British Painting Since 1900 (London: Phaidon, 1977).

- Sitwell, Osbert. "Patronage in Art Today - II," Listener 14 #348 (11 September 1935), pp.419-421.
- Spalding, Frances. British Art Since 1900 (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986).
- Standing Commission on Museums and Galleries. The National Museums and Galleries - The War Years and After [third report of the Standing Commission] (London: HMSO, 1948).
- Strachan, Alexander. "'Art for the People'," Scots Magazine, 37 #6 (September 1942), pp.409-412.
- Tate Gallery. British Painting 1910-1945 (London: Tate Gallery, 1967).
- . The Collections of the Tate Gallery: British Painting, Modern Painting and Sculpture (London: Tate Gallery, 1969).
- . The Tate Gallery's Wartime Acquisitions ([London]: Curwen Press, 1942).
- Tennyson, Charles. "The State and the Arts," Studio 125 #599 (February 1943), pp.57-58.
- Thomson, George P. Blue Pencil Admiral: The Inside Story of Press Censorship (London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co, Ltd, 1947).
- Townsend, William. The Townsend Journals: An Artist's Record of His Times 1928-51 (ed., Andrew Forge) (London: Tate Gallery, 1976).
- Vaughan, Keith. "A View of English Painting," New Writing and Daylight, ns (1943-1944), pp.87-97.
- Watson, Forbes. "Artists and Soldiers," Magazine of Art, 33 #6 (June 1940), p.333.
- . "Slackers Under the Skin," Magazine of Art, 32 #10 (October 1939), p.57.
- . "Unlimited Emergency," Magazine of Art, 34 (1941) p.289.
- Watson, Francis. Art Lies Bleeding (London: Chatto & Windus, 1939).
- White, A. Seaton. "The President's Address: 'Art and War',"

National Society of Art Masters Journal, 13 #3 (January-February 1941), pp.49-54.

White, Eric. The Arts Council of Great Britain (London: Davis-Poynter, 1975).

Whitechapel Art Gallery. Painting, Sculpture and Drawing in Britain 1940-49 (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 1972).

Wishart, Michael. High Diver (London: 1983).

Yorke, Malcolm. The Spirit of Place: Neo-Romantic Artists and Their Times (London: 1988)

\*SECTION 4: MoI and WAAC - Published Materials.

Anonymous. "The Londoner's Diary: ... Co-ordinated," Evening Standard (15 November 1939), p.4.

------. "Pictures of War," Times Literary Supplement, #2261 (2 June 1945), p.256.

------. "Recognition for War Artists," World's Press News and Advertisers' Review (28 May 1942), p.8.

------. "War Artists," Times (19 December 1939), p.9.

------. "War Art Explained by Film," Picture Post, 24 #11 (9 September 1944), p.16.

------. "The War: British War Pictures," Times Literary Supplement, #2103 (23 May 1942), p.255.

------. "War Artists: Salaried Posts and Work on Commission," Times (14 March 1940), p.5.

Arts Council of Great Britain. British Artists of the Second World War (Great Britain: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1965).

Balfour, Michael. Propaganda in War, 1939-1945: Organisation, Policies and Publics in Britain and Germany (London/Boston/Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979).

Black, John B. Organising the Propaganda Instrument: The British Experience (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975).

Bluecoat Gallery. Images of War: War Artists, 1939-1945 (Liverpool: Bluecoat Gallery, 1974).

Candidus. "Dead Hand on News," Daily Sketch (20 June 1941), p.6.

Clark, Kenneth. "War Artists at the National Gallery," Studio, 123 #586 (January 1942), pp.2-9.

Craig, Charles. The British Documentary Photograph as a Medium of Information and Propaganda During the Second World War 1939-1945 (M.Phil. thesis, Council for National Academic Awards (Committee for Art and Design Research, Research Sub-committee); sponsored by the Middlesex Polytechnic in collaboration with the Imperial War Museum, 1982).

------. "Documentary Photography in Britain 1939-1945: Implication or Evidence?," in European Society for the His-

tory of Photography, Symposium 1981: Proceedings and Papers. (Antwerp: Provinciaal Museum Voor Fotografie, 1981).

Crawford, Vivienne. Portraits of People at War (printed hand-out, 1981).

Curtis, Penelope, comp. World War Two: A Display of Pictures from the Collection to Mark the 50th Anniversary of the Outbreak of War in September 1939 (Liverpool: Tate Gallery Liverpool, 1989).

Defries, A. "Artists and the War [letter to the Editor]," Listener, 24 #601 (18 July 1940), p.94.

Dowling, Henry G. "War Pictures: Missing the Real Story [letter to the Editor]," Daily Telegraph (9 July 1940), p.4.

Eastment, Diana Jane. The Policies and Position of the British Council from the Outbreak of War to 1950 (Ph.D. thesis, School of History, University of Leeds, 1982).

Emanuel, Frank L. "The War Artists," Art and Reason, 17 #76 (April 1941), pp.5-6.

Fell, H. Granville. "Some Topics of the Moment: Art Made Tongue-tied by Authority," Connoisseur, 107 (1941), pp.79-80.

Frost, Rosamund. "The Artist-Reporter: 1855-1945," Art News, 44 #11 (September 1945), pp.12-19.

Gossop, R.P. "War in Pictures: Opportunities Missed? [letter to the Editor]," Daily Telegraph (8 July 1940), p.4.

Griffiths, Sarah. "War Painting: A No-Man's Land Between History and Reportage," Leeds Art Calendar, #78 (1976), pp.24-32.

Harries, Meirion and Susie Harries. The War Artists: British Official War Art of the Twentieth Century (London: Michael Joseph, in association with the Imperial War Museum and the Tate Gallery, 1983).

Haward, Lawrence. "Painting the Wartime Scene in Britain," Design, 45 (March 1944), pp.8-9.

Herring, Robert. "Editorial," Life and Letters To-day, 27 #39 (November 1940), pp.71-75.

Holme, R. "British Artists Paint the War," Studio, 120 (November 1940), pp.146-155.

- Imperial College. Consort Gallery. Department of Art. Drawings and Paintings of the Second World War (London: Imperial College of Science and Technology, 1980).
- Imperial War Museum: Art. A Concise Catalogue of Paintings, Drawings and Sculpture of the Second World War, 1939-1945 (London: IWM, 1964).
- : Art. British War Art of the 20th Century: The Official War Artists' Record of the Two World Wars (microfiche) (London: Minidata, 1982).
- Kestelman, Morris. "Artists Filmed at Work: 'Out of Chaos'," Our Time, 4 #7 (February 1945), pp.13-14.
- Lancaster, Osbert. "Modern Artists Paint for the Forces," Picture Post, 24 #5 (29 July 1944), pp.20-22.
- Mass-Observation. "Home Propaganda," Change: Bulletin of the Advertising Service Guild, #2 ([c.1941]), entire issue.
- McLaine, Ian. Ministry of Morale: Home Front Morale and the Ministry of Information in World War II (London/Boston/Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1979).
- McMurry, Ruth Emily and Muna Lee. The Cultural Approach: Another Way in International Relations (Port Washington, New York/London: Kennikat Press, 1947).
- Morris, Charles and Herbert Read. Eric Craven Gregory (Peter Gregory), 1887-1959: The Addresses in Tribute at the Cathedral, Bradford, on Monday 2 March 1959 by Sir Charles Morris, and at St. Luke's Church, Chelsea, on Thursday 5 March 1959 by Sir Herbert Read (England: [1959]).
- Museum of Modern Art, N.Y. Britain at War (Monroe Wheeler, ed.) (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1941).
- National Gallery. British War Artists (London: The Curwen Press, [1940]).
- Nettleton, Arthur. "Recording the War for Posterity," Chambers's Journal (November 1940), pp.777-778.
- New Metropole Arts Centre. Memorial Exhibition: The War Artists (Folkestone: New Metropole Arts Centre, 1964).
- Newton, Eric. War Through Artists' Eyes: Paintings and Drawings by British War Artists (London: John Murray, 1945).

- Oxford University Press. War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 1. War at Sea (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942).
- . War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 2. Blitz (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942).
- . War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 3. R.A.F. (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942).
- . War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 4. Army (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942).
- . War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 1. Women (Oxford/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1943).
- . War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 2. Production (Oxford/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1943).
- . War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 3. Soldiers (Oxford/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1943).
- . War Pictures by British Artists: Volume 4. Air Raids (Oxford/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1943).
- Powell, L.B. "War-Time Artists: A Neglected Sphere," Country Life, 87 (6 April 1940), p.366.
- Rhodes, Anthony. Propaganda: The Art of Persuasion: World War II (Victor Margolin, ed.), (New York/London: Chelsea House Publishers, 1976).
- Ross, Alan. Colours of War: War Art 1939-45 (London: Jonathan Cape, 1983).
- Secrest, Meryle. Kenneth Clark: A Biography (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1984).
- Stanton, F.N. "London During the Blitz: A Vivid Theme for Gifted Artists," Daily Telegraph (27 June 1942), p.2.
- Taylor, Philip M. "Techniques of Persuasion: Basic Ground Rules of British Propaganda During the Second World War," Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television, 1 #1 (1981), pp.57-65.
- Tyne and Wear County Museums. War Artists (No. 1 in a series of catalogues dealing with the Museums' collections) (Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Wear County Museums, 198-).



- War Artists' Advisory Committee. British War Artists: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Works Officially Commissioned by the Ministry of Information. Circulated by the British Institute of Adult Education Under the Auspices of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts ([London]: Shenval Press, n.d.).
- . Exhibition of British War Pictures (London: 1943). Copies have been located only in Australia.
- . Exhibition of National War Pictures (And a Few Pieces of Sculpture) (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1945).
- . India in Action: A Collection of Pictures by Anthony Gross; Official War Office Artist (London: National Gallery[?], 1943).
- . Paintings and Drawings by War Artists [circulated for CEMA by the BIAE] (London: BIAE, n.d.).
- . The War at Sea: A Series of Pictures Painted by Norman Wilkinson, O.B.E, P.R.I, and Presented by Him to the War Artists['] Advisory Committee (London: 1944). An almost identical catalogue, The War at Sea: A Series of Paintings by Norman Wilkinson, O.B.E., P.R.I., was published in Australia in 1945; copies have been located only in Australia.
- . War Pictures by British Artists: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Official War Pictures Circulated by Arrangement with the Museums Association. First Selection (London/Harrow: George Pullman & Sons, Ltd, [1940]).
- . War Pictures by British Artists: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Official War Pictures Circulated by Arrangement with the Museums Association. Second Selection ([London/Harrow: George Pullman & Sons, Ltd, 1941]).
- . War Pictures by British Artists: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Official War Pictures Circulated by Arrangement with the Museums Association. Third Selection ([London/Harrow: George Pullman & Sons, Ltd, 1943]).
- . War Pictures by British Artists: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Official War Pictures Circulated by Arrangement with the Museums Association. Fourth Selection ([London/Harrow: George Pullman & Sons, Ltd, 1942]).
- . War Pictures by British Artists: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Official War Pictures Circulated by Arrangement with the Museums Association. Fifth Selection

(London/Harrow: George Pullman & Sons, Ltd, [1944]).

-----. War Pictures by British Artists: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Original Drawings and Paintings of War Subjects Circulated by the Ministry of Information for Exhibition in Schools. First Selection (London/Harrow: George Pullman & Sons, Ltd, 1942).

-----. War Pictures by British Artists: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Works Officially Commissioned by the Ministry of Information. Circulated by the British Institute of Adult Education Under the Auspices of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (London: [1941]).

-----. War Pictures by British Artists: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Official War Pictures Selected by the Ministry of Information for Circulation in the West Indies (London: [c.1941]).

-----. War Pictures: Lithographs and Etchings Commissioned in 1940 on the Recommendation of the War Artists' Advisory Committee, Ministry of Information (brochure; no publication data).

Whitworth Art Gallery. War Pictures, 1929-1945 (Manchester: Whitworth Art Gallery, n.d.[1974+).

\*SECTION 4: MoI and WAAC - Miscellaneous Materials; see also Section 1.

Jennings, Humphrey, director. A Diary for Timothy (MoI film, 1944-1945) [includes views of war artists' exhibition, National Gallery].

-----, director. Listen to Britain (MoI film, 1942) [includes views of war artists' exhibition, National Gallery].

Lewes, Henry, director. Art in War (Omnibus film, BBC TV, 1973).

Sheppard, Jill, producer. Art in War (BBC film, 1978).

\*SECTION 5: Artists - Published, Archival and Miscellaneous Sources.

Entries are listed alphabetically by artist's name.

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Rosemary Allan (tape-recorded interview; accession #3820/03).

Anonymous. "Artist [E. Ardizzone] at the Front," Times Literary Supplement, #2081 (20 December 1941), p.639.

Ardizzone, Edward. Baggage to the Enemy (London: John Murray, 1941).

----- . Diary of a War Artist (London/Toronto/Sydney: The Bodley Head, 1974).

Blaikley, Ernest. "The Lighter Side of War Art," Studio, 135 #659 (February 1948), pp.48-51.

Foss, Brian. "'It's Not a Bad Life Sometimes': Edward Ardizzone's Drawings and Paintings of the Second World War," Imperial War Museum Review, #2 (1987), pp.15-22.

Imperial War Museum: Art. An Exhibition of Drawings by Edward Ardizzone, Official Artist 1940-45 (printed handout, n.d.).

-----: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Edward Jeffrey Irving Ardizzone, RA, ARCA, FSIA (tape-recorded interview; accession #4525/05).

Royal Academy of Arts. John Armstrong, 1893-1973 (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1975).

Bato, Joseph. Defiant City (with an introduction by J.B. Priestley) (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd, 1942).

Anonymous. An Exhibition of Pictures by Edward Bawden ([Egypt]: The Nile Press, [1940's]).

Imperial War Museum: Art. Edward Bawden: Travels of a War Artist 1940-1945 (printed handout, 1983).

----- . Edward Bawden: War Artist, and His Letters Home

1940-45 (Great Britain: Scolar Press, in association with the Imperial War Museum, 1989).

Beresford, Frank. [Correspondence with Alfred Yockney, 1940] (Tate: Yockney papers, 724.54).

Lipke, William. David Bomberg: A Critical Study of His Life and Work (London: Evelyn, Adams & Mackay Ltd, 1967).

Oxlade, Roy. David Bomberg, 1890-1945 (RCA Papers, #3). (London: Royal College of Art, 1977).

Cork, Richard. David Bomberg (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1987).

----- . "The Private Battles of a War Artist [D. Bomberg]," New Standard (26 February 1981), pp.22-23.

Buchan [James Boswell]. "Wanted, A Goya," Poetry and the People, #20 (June 1940), pp.22-24.

Cork, Richard. "Look Back in Anger [J. Boswell]," Sunday Times Magazine (21 November 1976), pp.82-83.

Curtis, Barry. "James Boswell," Block, #1 (1979), pp.53-56.

Slater, Montagu. "Private James Boswell," Our Time, 1 #12 (March 1942), pp.11-15.

Arts Council of Great Britain. William Coldstream (Great Britain: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1962).

Coldstream, William. [Correspondence with John S. Rake] (Tate: John S. Rake 787).

Imperial War Museum: Art. To the Front Line: Paintings of the Second World War by Leslie Cole (printed handout, 1985).

City of Edinburgh Museums and Art Galleries. Robert Colquhoun (Edinburgh: City of Edinburgh Museums and Art Galleries, 1981).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Raymond James Coxon, LG, ARCA (tape-recorded interview; accession #990/04).

Cuneo, Terence. Tanks and How to Draw Them (London/New York: The Studio, 1943).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: T. Cuneo (tape-recorded interview; accession #3827/08).

Anonymous. "William Dring," [Russell-Cotes Art Gallery & Museum] Bulletin (September 1946), pp.4-6.

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Clifford Ellis (tape-recorded interview; accession #4836/04).

Ensor, John. "An Artist Paints Industry," Art & Industry, 37 #220 (October 1944), pp.121-123.

Epstein, Jacob. An Autobiography (London: Vista Books, 1963). The first edition of Epstein's autobiography was published in 1940 as Let There Be Light. Epstein: An Autobiography was published in 1954 as a revised edition, with more information about the War years.

Bradford Art Galleries and Museums. Richard Eurich: A Retrospective Exhibition (Bradford: Bradford Art Galleries and Museums, 1980).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Richard Ernest Eurich (tape-recorded interview; accession #3818/04).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Dennis Flanders, RWS, RBA (tape-recorded interview; accession #3770/06).

Tate Gallery. Meredith Frampton (by Richard Morphet) (London: Tate Gallery, 1982).

Arts Council of Great Britain. Barnett Freedman, 1901-1958: A Catalogue of an Exhibition of Paintings, Drawings and Graphic Art (Great Britain: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1958).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Hubert Andrew Freeth (tape-recorded interview; accession #3821/01).

Anonymous. "Artists in Uniform: L.A.C. Tom Gourdie of the R.A.F," Art & Industry, 36 #213 (March 1944), pp.90-91.

Gross, Anthony. "India in Action: Seen Through the Eyes of Painter Anthony Gross," Illustrated (20 November 1943), pp.13-14.

-----". "Peintres aux armées britanniques," Arts, #82 (30 août, 1946), p.3.

Imperial War Museum: Art. Anthony Gross RA: Battle Lines (printed handout, 1981).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Bernard Hailstone (tape-recorded interview accession #4797/02).

J. Leger & Son. Exhibition of War Drawings by Clifford Hall (London: J. Leger & Son, 1941).

Leicester Galleries. 'Fire-Fighters of London': Paintings and Drawings by Auxiliary Fireman Haybrook (London: J. Miles & Co, Ltd, 1940).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Colin Hayes (tape-recorded interview; accession #5259/03).

Henderson, Keith. "Notes of a Peaceful Artist in War Time," Listener, 26 #666 (16 October 1941), p.535.

-----". "War-time Notes of a Peaceful Artist," Listener, 25 #637 (27 March 1941), pp.452-453.

Imperial War Museum: Art. Thomas Hennell: Watercolours 1941-1945 (printed handout, 1981).

MacLeod, Michael. Thomas Hennell: Countryman, Artist and

Writer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: R.N. Hepple (tape-recorded interview; accession #969/02).

West Wales Arts. Ray Howard-Jones (Wales: West Wales Arts, 1983).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: E.E. Hudson (tape-recorded interview; accession #6085/02).

Anonymous. "A Kapp Supplement," New Statesman and Nation, 21 #523 (1 March 1941), p.207.

-----". "Drawings by Kapp," New Statesman and Nation, 21 #524 (8 March 1941), pp.241-248.

H.F. "Eric Kennington: Drawing the R.A.F. A Book of Portraits Introduced by Sir Ronald Storrs," Apollo, 35 (1942), p.97.

Imperial War Museum: Art. Eric Kennington: War Artist (printed handout, 1980).

Kennington, Eric. Drawing the R.A.F.: A Book of Portraits (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942).

-----". Pilots, Workers, Machines (Great Britain: [no publisher indicated, 1941]).

-----". "Re-dedication and Reconstruction," Studio, 123 #586 (January 1942), pp.13-14.

-----". Tanks and Tank-folk (Great Britain: Country Life Ltd, [1943]).

Pearce, Herbert. "War Pastels by Eric Kennington," Studio, 126 #604 (July 1943), pp.16-21.

[Kenyon, B. Ley]. The Great Escape: Stalag Luft III. From the Original Drawings Made by Ley Kenyon, 1943 (London: privately published, [1978?]).



- Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Morris Kestelman (tape-recorded interview; accession #4995/04).
- Dunbar, Janet. Laura Knight (London: Collins, 1975).
- Knight, Laura. "Adventure in War-time Art," Public Opinion (6 November 1942), p.246.
- ". "An Artist in the Nuremberg Courtroom," Listener, 35 #892 (14 February 1946), p.199.
- ". The Magic of a Line: The Autobiography of Laura Knight (London: William Kimber, 1965).
- Clements, Keith. Henry Lamb: The Artist and His Friends. (Bristol: Redcliffe, 1985).
- Meyers, Jeffrey. The Enemy: A Biography of Wyndham Lewis (London/Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980).
- Collis, Maurice. The Discovery of L.S. Lowry (London/Bradford: distributed by Lund Humphries for Alex Reid & Lefevre Ltd, 1951).
- Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: John Mansbridge (tape-recorded interview; accession #4994/02).
- Medley, Robert. Drawn From Life: A Memoir (London/Boston: Faber and Faber, 1983).
- Royal Academy of Arts. Drawings and Paintings by Sir Thomas Monnington, PRA, 1902-1976 (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1977).
- BBC. Henry Moore at Eighty (made by John Read, 1978) (Tate: Henry Moore TAV 65ABC - 13 reels of sound tape; 35 reels of film offcuts; miscellaneous related material).
- BBC Radio 4. Kaleidoscope (tape-recorded interview with Henry Moore, May 1975) (Tate: Henry Moore TAV 31AB).
- Clark, Kenneth. Henry Moore Drawings (London: Thames and Hud-

son, 1974).

Gilmour, Pat. [typescript excerpts from an interview with Henry Moore] (Tate: Henry Moore 8022.5).

Grigson, Geoffrey. Henry Moore (in Kenneth Clark, ed., The Penguin Modern Painters) (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1943).

Imperial War Museum: Art. Henry Moore: War Drawings (printed handout, 1975).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict : Henry Moore, OM, CH (tape-recorded interview; accession #785/01).

Marlborough Fine Art Ltd. and Rembrandt Verlag GmbH, eds. Henry Moore: Shelter-Sketch-Book; with 80 facsimile collotypes and one original lithograph by the artist (London/Berlin: Marlborough Fine Art Ltd./Rembrandt Verlag GmbH, 1967).

Russell, John and Vera Russell (tape-recorded interview with Henry Moore, n.d.) (Tate: Henry Moore TAV 23B).

Sylvester, David, ed. Henry Moore, Volume One: Sculpture and Drawings, 1921-1948 (introduction by Herbert Read) (London: Percy Lund, Humphries & Company Ltd, 1944/1957 (4th, revised, edition)).

Wilkinson, Alan G. The Drawings of Henry Moore (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, Courtauld Institute, 1974, 3 vols.).

Royal Academy of Arts. Rodrigo Moynihan: A Retrospective Exhibition (text by Lawrence Gowing) (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1978).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict : John Northcote Nash (tape-recorded interview; accession #323/05).

Bertram, Anthony. Paul Nash: The Portrait of an Artist (manuscript) (V & A: English Manuscripts - Typewritten, 86.X.31).

----- . Paul Nash: The Portrait of an Artist (London: Faber and Faber, [1955]).

Causey, Andrew. Paul Nash: The Development of his Painting, with a Catalogue of his Work (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, Courtauld Institute of Art, 1973, 2 vols.).

Eates, Margot. Paul Nash: Master of the Image (London: John Murray, 1973).

King, James. Interior Landscapes: A Life of Paul Nash (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987).

Nash, Margaret. Memoir of Paul Nash, 1913-1946 (manuscript) (V & A: English Manuscripts - Typewritten, 86.EE.14).

Nash, Paul. [Correspondence with Ruth Clark, c.1944] (Tate: Paul Nash 7411.6).

------. [Paul Nash's correspondence with British Institute of Adult Education, Central Institute of Art and Design, War Artists' Advisory Committee, Lord Esher, Percy Jowett, John Piper, John Nash, Eric Newton, Kenneth Clark, Richard Seddon, Conrad Senat and others; papers relating to the Arts Bureau at Oxford and to the Society of Mural Painters] (Tate: Paul Nash 7050).

------. [Paul Nash's correspondence with various people, especially Barbara Bertram, Ruth Clark, John Nash, Clare Neilson, Charles Neilson and Lance Sieveking] (V & A: English Manuscripts - Typewritten, 86.X.25).

------. [Paul Nash's correspondence with Gordon Bottomley, 1910-1946] V & A: English Manuscripts - Typewritten, 86.X.28,29).

------. Outline: An Autobiography, and Other Writings (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1949).

------. "The Personality of Planes," Vogue, 95 #21 (March 1942), pp.42-43,76.

Rothenstein, John. "Paul Nash as War Artist" (in Margot Eates, ed., Paul Nash: Paintings, Drawings and Illustrations) (London: Lund Humphries, 1948).

Nevinson, C.R.W. "The Artist in Peace and War: His Work Vitalised by Experience [letter to the Editor]," Daily Telegraph (16 March 1940), p.6.

------. [Miscellaneous papers] (Tate: C.R.W. Nevinson 7311).

[Tilney, F.C.]. "Nevinson in the Arena," Art and Reason, 9

#102 (June 1943), pp.4-5.

Orde, Cuthbert. Pilots of Fighter Command: Sixty-four Portraits (London/Toronto/Bombey/Sidney: George P. Harrap & Company Ltd, 1942).

Batchelor, John. Mervyn Peake: A Biographical and Critical Exploration (London: Gerald Duckworth & Company Limited, 1984).

Gilmore, Maeve. A World Away: A Memoir of Mervyn Peake (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd, 1970).

Gilmore, Maeve and Shelagh Johnson. Mervyn Peake: Writings and Drawings (London/New York: Academy Editions/St. Martin's Press, 1974).

Watney, John. Mervyn Peake (London: Michael Joseph, 1976).

Betjeman, John. John Piper (in Kenneth Clark, ed., The Penguin Modern Painters) (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Limited, 1944).

Joyce, Paul. The Arbitrary Eye (transcript of an interview with John Piper, October 1982) (Tate: John Piper TAV 327B).

Binyon, Helen. Eric Ravilious: Memoir of an Artist (Guildford/London: [no publisher indicated], 1983).

Harling, Robert. Notes on the Wood Engravings of Eric Ravilious (series: Aerial Books on the Arts) (London: published for The Shenvel Press by Faber and Faber Limited, 1946).

Imperial War Museum: Art. Eric Ravilious Watercolours 1940-42 (printed handout, 1979).

Arts Council of Great Britain. The Rose of Death: Paintings and Drawings by Captain Albert Richards (1919-1945), 6th Airborne Division and Official War Artist (Great Britain: Arts Council of Great Britain, [1978]).

Whitechapel Art Gallery. Claude Rogers: Paintings and Drawings, 1927-1973 (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 1973).

Rosoman, Leonard. "Developments in Style VI," London Magazine (August 1962).

Weight, Angela. Leonard Rosoman: A War Retrospective, 1939-45 (London: Imperial War Museum, 1989).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Michael Rothenstein (tape-recorded interview; accession #3829/05).

Anonymous. "The War: Our Flying Men; R.A.F. Life in Pen and Picture [W. Rothenstein]," Times Literary Supplement, #2097 (11 April 1942), p.183.

Rothenstein, John. Materials for a Life of William Rothenstein (manuscript notes; 4 vols.; n.d.) (V & A: English Manuscripts).

Rothenstein, William. Men of the R.A.F. (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942).

Scott, Peter Markham. The Battle of the Narrow Seas: A History of the Light Coastal Forces in the Channel and North Sea, 1939-1945 (London: Country Life Ltd, 1945).

----- . The Eye of the Wind (Great Britain: Hodder and Stoughton, 1961/1966 (revised edition)).

Goodman, Jean. Edward Seago: The Other Side of the Canvas (London: Collins, 1978).

Seago, Edward. A Canvas to Cover (London: Collins, 1947).

----- . High Endeavour (London: Collins, 1944).

----- . Peace in War (London: Collins, 1943).

----- . With the Allied Armies in Italy (London: Collins, 1945).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Richard H. Seddon, RWS, ARCA (tape-recorded interview; accession #960/04).

Seddon, Richard. A Hand Uplifted (London: Frederick Muller Limited, 1963).

- Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Rupert Shephard (tape-recorded interview; accession #3198/04).
- Skeaping, John. Drawn from Life: An Autobiography (London: Collins, 1977).
- Spencer, Gilbert. Memoirs of a Painter (London: Chatto & Windus, 1974).
- Arts Council of Great Britain. Spencer in the Shipyard: Paintings and Drawings by Stanley Spencer and Photographs by Cecil Beaton from the Imperial War Museum (Great Britain: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1981).
- Imperial War Museum: Art. Stanley Spencer: Shipbuilding on the Clyde (printed handout, 1989).
- Johnson, Robin. "Stanley Spencer: Shipbuilding on the Clyde, 1940-46" (in Brighton Art Gallery and Museum, Stanley Spencer) (Brighton: Art Gallery and Museum, 1976).
- Rothenstein, John, ed. Stanley Spencer: The Man. Correspondence and Reminiscences (London: Paul Elek, 1979).
- Royal Academy of Arts. Stanley Spencer (London: Royal Academy, in association with Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1980).
- Spencer, Stanley. [Correspondence with Hilda Carline Spencer, Jill Craigie, Arthur Tooth and the War Artists' Advisory Committee; notes on his shipbuilding pictures] (Tate: Stanley Spencer 733).
- Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Julius Stafford Baker (tape-recorded interview; accession #5398/04).
- Arts Council of Great Britain, Welsh Committee. Graham Sutherland: Drawings of Wales (Great Britain: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1963).
- Barber, Noel. Conversations with Painters [G. Sutherland] (London: Collins, 1964).
- Graham Sutherland Gallery (Picton Castle, Haverfordwest, Dyfed). Sutherland in Wales/Sutherland yng Nghymru (London:

Alistair McAlpine, 1976).

Marlborough Fine Art Ltd. Sketchbook [G. Sutherland] (London: Marlborough Fine Art Ltd, n.d.).

Rothenstein, Michael. Looking at Pictures [G. Sutherland] (London: George Routledge and Sons Ltd, 1947).

Sutherland, Graham. [Correspondence with Kenneth Clark and Eric Gregory] (Picton Castle Trust; microfilm copies in Tate: Graham Sutherland TAM 67/1-22).

Tassi, Roberto. Sutherland: The Wartime Drawings (Gabriella Borsano, ed.; trans. and with a foreword by Julian Andrews) (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1979).

M. Knoedler & Co. Inc, and P. & D. Colnaghi & Co. Ltd. Exhibition of Drawings by Feliks Topolski, Polish Official War Artist (London: M. Knoedler/P. & D. Colnaghi, 1941).

Thos. Agnew & Sons, Ltd. Exhibition of Pictures from Russia by Feliks Topolski, Polish Official War Artist, organised by the Polish Relief Fund, Poland's Armed Forces Comforts Fund [and] the British Committee for Polish Welfare (London: Thos. Agnew & Sons, Ltd, 1942).

Topolski, Feliks. "Contemporary Comment and Caricature," Burlington Magazine, 83 #484 (July 1943), pp.164-168.

----- . Russia in War: London - Summer 1941; Russia-bound Convoy; A British Cruiser; Iceland (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1942).

----- . "The Russian Front War Pictures," Art & Industry, 33 #194 (August 1942), pp.27-35.

----- . Three Continents, 1944-45: England, Mediterranean Convoy, Egypt, East Africa, Palestine, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, India, Burma Front, China, Italian Campaign, Germany Defeated (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1946).

-----, and James Laver. Britain in Peace and War (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1941).

Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Julian Trevelyan (tape-recorded interview; accession #3172/02).

Trevelyan, Julian. Indigo Days (London: MacGibbon & Keer, 1957).

- Barber, Noel. Conversations with Painters [K. Vaughan] (London: Collins, 1964).
- Vaughan, Keith. Journal & Drawings (London: Alan Ross, 1966).
- Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: Carel Weight (tape-recorded interview; accession #3171/03).
- Roeder, Helen, ed. The Curious Captain: The Letters of Carel Weight when a War Artist in Italy, Austria and Greece 1945-6 (manuscript; copy in Imperial War Museum: Art).
- Wilkinson, Norman. A Brush With Life (London: Seeley Service & Co Ltd, 1969).
- Larkin, David, ed., and John Blake (introduction). The Aviation Art of Frank Wootton (New York/Toronto/London: Bantam Books, 1976).
- Imperial War Museum: Sound Records. Artists in an Age of Conflict: John Worsley, RSMA (tape-recorded interview accession #3173/03).
- Jones, Martin D.W, "Into the Lion's Mouth: John Worsley, War Artist," Country Life, 179 #4618 (20 February 1986), pp.448-449.



\*SECTION 6: Exhibition Reviews, 1940.

Anonymous. "British War Artists at the National Gallery," New Statesman and Nation, 20 #490 (13 July 1940), p.40.

------. "London Correspondence: War Pictures," Nottingham Guardian (27 August 1940), p.4.

------. "More War Pictures at the National Gallery," Connoisseur, 106 (November 1940), p.215.

------. "National Gallery: First War Pictures," Times (2 July 1940), p.6.

------. "National Gallery: New War Pictures," Times (5 December 1940), p.6.

------. "Our London Correspondence: More War Pictures," Manchester Guardian (24 August 1940), p.6.

------. "Pictures by War Artists: Records of Historical Events," Times (24 August 1940), p.6.

------. "Pictures by War Artists: the Civilians' Part," Times (16 October 1940), p.6.

------. "War Artists at the National Gallery," New Statesman and Nation (31 August 1940), p.207.

------. "War Artists' Exhibition at National Gallery," Glasgow Herald (12 October 1940), p.7.

------. "War Artists' Pictures: Withdrawal and Return from Dunkirk," Observer (25 August 1940), p.8.

------. "The War: As Artists See It; Monstrous Machines -- Men Like Ants," Evening News (2 July 1940), p.5.

------. "War Paintings, But Without Germans," Daily Mail (2 July 1940), p.3.

Astragal. "Notes and Topics: ... War Pictures," Architects' Journal, 92 (11 July 1940), pp.24-25.

Bradshaw, P.V. "Artists in Wartime," Strand Magazine, 98 (February 1940), pp.376-380.

Byron, Robert. "British Art in This War," Country Life, 87 #2265 (15 June 1940), pp.384-385.

Connolly, Cyril. "Round the National Gallery," New Statesman

and Nation, 20 #511 (7 December 1940), pp.562-563.

Cooper, Douglas. "War Artists' Exhibition at the National Gallery," Burlington Magazine, 77 #451 (October 1940), pp.128-129.

Earp, T.W. "War Artists' First Works: Vivid Pictures at Gallery," Daily Telegraph (2 July 1940).

[Editor]. "The War and the Artist," Studio, 120 #572 (November 1940), p.176.

Fell, H. Granville. "Some Topics of the Moment: The British War Artists," Connoisseur, 106 (1940), pp.77-78.

Gordon, Jan. "Art and Artists," Observer (20 October 1940), p.2.

----- "Art and Artists: Work of War Artists," Observer (7 July 1940), p.11.

Hale, Lionel. "Art Dodged Bombs," News Chronicle (2 July 1940), p.2.

McGreevy, Thomas. "London," Studio, 120 #57 (October 1940), pp.136-137.

N. [Eric Newton]. "War Pictures at National Gallery," Manchester Guardian (2 July 1940), p.6.

Newton, Eric. "New War Pictures," Sunday Times (15 September 1940), p.2.

----- "Paul Nash's War Paintings," Sunday Times (1 September 1940), p.2.

----- "Pictures of the War," Sunday Times (7 July 1940), p.2.

----- "The Poetry of War: Fine Achievement of Modern Painters; Beginnings of Renaissance," Sunday Times (29 December 1940), p.10.

----- "War Painters Again," Sunday Times (11 August 1940), p.2.

Oppe, Paul. "Painting in War Time," Britain To-day, #49 (21 March 1941 [refers to July 1940 exhibition]), pp.4-8.

Piper, John. "Art: New War Pictures," Spectator, 165 #5854 (6 September 1940), p.242.

------. "Art: Pictures of the War," Spectator, 165 #5846  
(12 July 1940), p.35.

Raverat, G. "Art: British War Artists," Time and Tide, 21 #28  
(13 July 1940), p.735.

Read, Herbert. "Pictures of the War," Listener, 24 #599 (4  
July 1940), pp.22-23.

[Tilney, F.C.], "British War Artists," Art & Reason, 6 #68  
(August 1940), p.8.

\*SECTION 6: Exhibition Reviews, 1941.

Anonymous. "Art, Music, Drama: Five Stars," The [University of Toronto] Varsity (18 November 1941); copy in newspaper clippings scrapbook #8 (1939-1946), Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal Archive.

----- . "Artists Depict a War-torn World: Exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art Graphically Presents Great Britain's Trial in This and the First World War," New York Times (1 June 1941), Section 9, p.7.

----- . "Artists Depict Raid Scenes: London Exhibition," Daily Telegraph (17 January 1941), p.3.

----- . "Brilliant Pictures by War Artists," Leicester Mercury (2 August 1941), p.3.

----- . "Britain at War," Art Digest, 15 #17 (1 June 1941), p.27.

----- . "British Will Hold Aloft Banner of Artistic Spirit," Ottawa Citizen [incorrectly dated 15 November 1941; copy in newspaper clippings scrapbook, Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto].

----- . "Canadians Evince Pride in Artists' Recognition," Toronto Telegram (21 November 1941), p.19.

----- . "Exhibition of Britain at War Held at Museum of Modern Art [New York]," [Montreal] Gazette (21 June 1941), p.3.

----- . "Front Line Art," [Toronto] New World (illustrated magazine) (October 1941), pp.46-[48].

----- . "Germans Would Kill All Art," London [Ontario] Daily Free Press (15 November 1941), p.15.

----- . "London Letter: More Official War Paintings," Birmingham Post (4 October 1941), p.2.

----- . "London Letter: More War Pictures," Belfast News Letter (4 October 1941), p.4.

----- . "The Londoner's Diary: Artists in Uniform," Evening Standard (4 October 1941), p.2

----- . "National Gallery: New War Pictures," Times (7 October 1941), p.6.

- . "New War Pictures: Exhibition at National Gallery," Times (10 July 1941), p.6.
- . "Notes on Exhibits," Glasgow Herald (12 April 1941), p.2.
- . "Notes on Exhibits: War Paintings in National Gallery," Glasgow Herald (10 July 1941), p.6.
- . "Our London Correspondence: ... New War Pictures," Manchester Guardian (18 October 1941), p.6.
- . "Our London Correspondence: More War Pictures," Manchester Guardian (10 May 1941), p.6.
- . "Our London Correspondence: ... War Pictures at the National Gallery," Manchester Guardian (17 January 1941), p.4.
- . "Our London Letter: More War Paint," Liverpool Post (9 May 1941), p.2.
- . "Our London Letter: More War Paint," Liverpool Post (4 October 1941), p.2.
- . "Pictures by War Artists: Records of Air Raid Damage," Times (20 January 1941), p.6.
- . "Pictures of Nation at War: On View at Mansfield Art Gallery," Nottingham Guardian (4 April 1941), pp.2-3.
- . "Pictures Show British at War," [New York] Sun (23 May 1941); copy in newspaper clippings file, Museum of Modern Art, New York.
- . "'Resolute British' Lauded by Halifax: ... 'Britain at War' in Art," New York Times, 23 May 1941, p.12.
- . "600 Attend Opening 'Britain-at-War Exhibit,'" [Ottawa] Journal (11 October 1941), p.7.
- . "Talk of the Day: New War Pictures," Evening News (9 May 1941), p.2.
- . "The United States: British War Artists," Studio, 122, #583 (October 1941), p.116.
- . "Urges Ottawa Seek Artists to Depict War," [Toronto] Globe and Mail [incorrectly dated 15 November 1941; copy in newspaper clippings scrapbook, Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto].

- . "The War in Paint: Striking Exhibition in London," Cape Argus [South Africa] (10 July 1941), p.9.
- . "War Artists," New Statesman and Nation, 22 #546 (9 August 1941), p.134.
- . "War Artists' Paintings: Belfast Exhibition," Belfast Telegraph (13 June 1941), p.3.
- . "War Pictures for the Nation: Exhibition at National Gallery," Times (7 March 1941), p.6.
- . "War Pictures: National Gallery Exhibition; Deepening Response of Artists," Times (9 May 1941), p.2.
- Bridle, Augustus. "British War Art Startling Display," Toronto Daily Star (14 November 1941), p.46.
- Burrows, Carlyle. "The War as Seen by British Artists," New York Herald Tribune (1 June 1941), Section VI, p.3.
- Collis, Maurice. "Art: Four Exhibitions," Time and Tide, 22 #41 (11 October 1941), p.869.
- E.A.E. "Sunderland Attraction: Official War Pictures on Exhibition," Sunderland Echo (20 May 1941), p.4.
- Fell, H. Granville. "The Connoisseur Divan: War Pictures at the National Gallery," Connoisseur, 108 #482 (December 1941), pp.217-218.
- . "Some Topics of the Moment: July's War Pictures," Connoisseur, 108 #480 (August 1941), pp.84-85.
- . "Some Topics of the Moment: New War Pictures at the National Gallery," Connoisseur, 107 #478 (June 1941), pp.266-267.
- Genauer, Emily. "Britain at War - A Stirring Exhibit: Museum of Modern Art Show; Pictures by English Artists," [incorrectly identified as New York Times, 19 May 1941; copy in Museum of Modern Art Archive].
- Gordon, Cora J. "The War in Art: A Rochdale Exhibition," Rochdale Observer (25 January 1941), p.4.
- Gordon, Jan. "Art and Artists," Observer (16 March 1941), p.9.
- . "Art and Artists," Observer (8 June 1941), p.7.
- E.W.H. "'Britain at War' Exhibition of Art Proves Unique Event," [Ottawa] Citizen (11 October 1941), p.25.

- G.R.H. "Exhibition of War Pictures," [Aberdeen] Press and Journal (25 March 1941), p.2.
- Hickey, William. "Havoc for Keeps," Daily Express (9 May 1941), p.2.
- Holme, Rathbone. "Art News and Exhibitions: London and the Provinces; More War Pictures in the National Gallery," Studio, 121 #579 (June 1941), p.198.
- ". "Art News and Exhibitions: London and the Provinces; New War Pictures," Studio, 122 #582 (September 1941), pp.82-83.
- Lancaster, Osbert. "Art: War Paintings at the National Gallery," Spectator, 166 #5883 (28 March 1941), p.343.
- Laver, James. "British War Artists: Behind the Mechanised Lines," Country Life, 89 #2295 (11 January 1941), pp.40-41.
- Lindley, Jack. "War Pictures on View: Work of British Artists," Halifax Courier & Guardian (6 December 1941), p.5.
- E.M. "War Pictures at Castle Museum: Rapid Brushwork and Flashes of Colour," [Norwich] Eastern Daily Press (19 June 1941), p.2.
- McCarthy, Pearl. "Art and Artists," [Toronto] Globe and Mail [incorrectly dated 15 November 1941; copy in newspaper clippings scrapbook, Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto].
- McGreevy, Thomas. "Art in Britain and America: London," Studio, 121 #576 (March 1941), p.59.
- McInnes, Graham. "'Britain at War' Exhibition," [Toronto] Saturday Night (28 June 1941), p.26.
- ". "British War Pictures," [Toronto] Saturday Night (29 November 1941), p.8.
- N. [Eric Newton]. "New War Pictures at the National Gallery," Manchester Guardian (10 July 1941), p.3.
- Newton, Eric. "The Artist as Prophet," Sunday Times (5 January 1941), p.2.
- ". "War Pictures," Sunday Times (18 May 1941), p.6.
- Petts, John. "Official War Art," Life and Letters To-day, 29 #46 (June 1941), pp.203-207.

Piper, John. "Art: New War Pictures," Spectator, 166 #5891 (23 May 1941), p.551.

------. "Art: War Art at the National Gallery," Spectator, 167 #5911 (10 October 1941), p.335.

K.R. "Some Recent Additions: War Artists' Exhibition at the National Gallery," [AIA] Bulletin, #66 (July 1941), [pp.2-3].

R.C.S. "War Pictures in Leeds: Work of British Artists," Yorkshire Post and Leeds Mercury (19 September 1941), p.5.

Stanley, Sidney, "The War Artists: A Protest," Art and Reason, 7 #75 (March 1941), pp.6-7.

Swaffer, Hannen. "Wasted Genius," Daily Herald (13 May 1941), p.2.

T.T. "An Exhibition of War Pictures," Manchester Guardian (19 July 1941), p.5.

Varga, Margit. "Britain Mobilizes Her Artists. What About America?," Magazine of Art, 34 #6 (June-July 1941), pp.298-303.

Wandering Scot. "The Passing Show: ... Clyde Workers in Paint," Edinburgh Evening News (18 October 1941), p.3.



\*SECTION 6: Exhibition Reviews, 1942.

Anonymous. "'Britain at War' Paintings," Montreal Standard [incorrectly dated 31 January 1942; copy in newspaper clippings scrapbook #8 (1939-1946), Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal Archive].

------. "Exhibition of War Pictures," British Weekly, 113 #2922 (29 October 1942), p.59.

------. "Exhibition of War Pictures: A Further Selection Times (23 October 1942), p.2.

------. "London Letter: More War Pictures," Birmingham Post (29 May 1942), p.2.

------. "London Letter: New War Pictures," Birmingham Post (23 October 1942), p.2.

------. "London Notes and Comment: New War Pictures," Yorkshire Post and Leeds Mercury (29 May 1942), p.2.

------. "National Gallery: Exhibition of New War Pictures," Museums Journal, 42 #6 (September 1942), pp.148-149.

------. "National Gallery: New War Pictures," Times (5 June 1942), p.8.

------. "New War Paintings by British Artists," Dorset County Chronicle (25 June 1942), p.7.

------. "New War Pictures: Mr. Paul Nash's 'Battle of Britain'," Times (23 January 1942), p.6.

------. "Our London Correspondence: ... More War Pictures," Manchester Guardian (24 October 1942), p.6.

------. "Outstanding War Pictures," Gloucestershire Echo (23 May 1942), p.3.

------. "Pictorial Record 'Britain at War' Now Showing at Art Association," [Montreal] Gazette, 3 January 1942, p.10.

------. "Talk of the Day: National Gallery Additions," Evening News (28 May 1942), p.2.

------. "Two Exhibitions Due to Conclude Shortly: New English Art Club and Britain at War Shows Offer Variety," [Montreal] Gazette, 17 January 1942, p.10.

- . "Our London Letter: War Paint," Liverpool Post (23 October 1942), p.2.
- . "War Artists' Pictures," East Anglian Daily Times (28 October 1942), p.2.
- Ayre, Robert, "Art News and Reviews: 'Britain at War' Paintings Miss Aim, Critic Finds, [Montreal] Gazette [incorrectly dated 10 January 1942; copy in newspaper clippings scrapbook #8 (1939-1946), Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal Archive].
- . "Last Look at Exhibit 'Britain at War' Shows One Visit Not Enough," [Montreal] Standard (24 January 1942), p.27.
- Brandon, O.H. "Scenes of the London Blitz Enthral America," Daily Telegraph (5 September 1942), p.2.
- Earp, T.W, "Fewer Robots in War Pictures: Human Note First," Daily Telegraph (23 October 1942), p.3.
- Fell, H. Granville. "The Connoisseur Divan: The Latest War Pictures," Connoisseur, 110 (1942), pp.161-163.
- . "The Connoisseur Divan: New War Pictures," Connoisseur, 109 (1942), pp.81-82.
- . "The Connoisseur Divan: Our New War Pictures," Connoisseur, 110 (1942), pp.74-75.
- Gordon, Jan. "Art and Artists," Observer (1 February 1942), p.7.
- . "London Commentary," Studio, 123 #590 (May 1942), p.114.
- . "War Paintings: New Display at National Gallery," Liverpool Post (1 June 1942), p.2.
- Humphreys, H. Norman. "British War Pictures: The National Gallery Exhibition," Bootle Times (13 November 1942), p.3.
- Lambe, Ivor. "The War on Canvas," Strand Magazine, 102 (January 1942), pp.349-350.
- N. [Eric Newton]. "The National Gallery: New War Pictures," Manchester Guardian (24 January 1942), p.5.
- E.N. [Eric Newton]. "New War Paintings," Manchester Guardian (29 May 1942), p.3.

- Peterborough. "London Day by Day: ... Nation's War Pictures," Daily Telegraph (23 October 1942), p.4.
- Pucinelli, Dorothy. "Art: San Francisco," California Arts & Architecture, 59 (May 1942), pp.8-9.
- Swaffer, Hannen. "War Through Frank Eyes," Daily Herald (5 February 1942), p.2.
- Wilkinson, Kenneth. "Britain's War Art Example," Melbourne Herald (1 October 1942); copy in Australian War Memorial, Archive file AWM 93.

\*SECTION 6: Exhibition Reviews, 1943.

- . "British Artists Record the War For Our Grandchildren," Maidenhead Advertiser (25 August 1943), p.3.
- . "British War Pictures at Gallery," [Adelaide] Advertiser (20 December 1943), p.4.
- . "City and Country: War Pictures at Usher Gallery," Lincolnshire Echo (22 September 1943), p.3.
- . "'India in Action': Drawings by Captain A. Gross," Times (24 November 1943), p.6.
- . "London Letter: New War Pictures," Birmingham Post (5 March 1943), p.2.
- . "London Letter: Pictures by War Artists," Birmingham Post (13 August 1943), p.2.
- . "London News and Comment: New War Pictures," Scotsman (5 March 1943), p.4.
- . "London News and Comment: New War Pictures," Scotsman (14 August 1943), p.4.
- . "London Notes and Comment: New War Paintings," Yorkshire Post and Leeds Mercury (16 August 1943), p.2.
- . "New War Pictures: Exhibition at National Gallery," Times (13 August 1943), p.6.
- . "Our London Letter: War and Art," Liverpool Daily Post (6 March 1943), p.2.
- . "Our London Letter: War Pictures," Eastern Daily Press (14 August 1943), p.2.
- . "Pictures by War Artists: National Gallery Additions," Times (5 March 1943), p.6.
- . "Talk of the Day: New War Pictures," Evening News (12 August 1943), p.2.
- . "War Artist's 18 Africa Paintings," Manchester Daily Dispatch (13 August 1943), p.3.
- . "War Pictures," SALT [Australian Army Education Service] (10 May 1943), pp.33-34.
- Apocalypt. "British Artists Depict War Scenes," [Adelaide]

- News (23 December 1943); copy in newspaper clippings file, Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide.
- Collis, Maurice. "Art: Miscellaneous Exhibitions," Time and Tide, 24 #11 (13 March 1943), pp.203-204.
- Earp, T.W. "War Artists' Exhibition: A Lively Record," Daily Telegraph (17 August 1943), p.4.
- Fell, H. Granville. "The Connoisseur Divan: New Pictures by War Artists," Connoisseur, 112 (September 1943), p.60.
- Fuller, H.E. "Exhibition of British War Pictures," [Adelaide Advertiser] (23 December 1943), p.3.
- Gordon, Jan. "London Commentary," Studio, 126 #608 (November 1943), pp.159-161.
- ". "Our London Letter: Front Line," Liverpool Post (19 November 1943), p.2.
- Lancaster, Osbert. "'India in Action'," Listener, 30 #776 (25 November 1943), p.609.
- N. [Eric Newton]. "Art Exhibitions in London," Manchester Guardian (6 March 1943), p.5.
- E.N. [Eric Newton]. "Anthony Gross," Manchester Guardian (22 November 1943), p.3.
- ". "The National Gallery: New War Pictures," Manchester Guardian (13 August 1943), p.3.
- Newton, Eric. "Drawings by Anthony Gross," Sunday Times (21 November 1943), p.2.
- ". "War Artists' Exhibition: A Special Story," Sunday Times (22 August 1943).
- D.S. "War Pictures at Salford," Manchester Guardian [incorrectly dated 12 June 1943; copy in 1943 newspaper clippings envelope, National Gallery Archive].
- [Vaughan, Keith]. "War Artists and the War," Penguin New Writing, #16 (March 1943), pp.108-117.
- Wilenski, R.H. "English, New English and London Art," Listener, 30 #773 (4 November 1943), p.525.

\*SECTION 6: Exhibition Reviews, 1944.

Anonymous. "Artists' Impressions of the War," Hull Daily Mail (14 March 1944), p.3.

------. "London Letter: War Artists," Birmingham Post (7 October 1944), p.4.

------. "London Letter: War Artists' Anniversary," Birmingham Post (6 March 1944), p.2.

------. "London News and Comment: War Artists' Exhibition," Scotsman (7 October 1944), p.4.

------. "New War Pictures: Further Exhibition at National Gallery," Times (12 October 1944), p.7.

------. "New War Pictures: National Gallery Exhibition," Times (3 March 1944) p.6.

------. "Official Pictures," Sussex Daily News and [Brighton] Evening Argus (3 March 1944), p.2.

------. "Our London Correspondence: Pictures of the War at Sea," Manchester Guardian (23 September 1944), p.4.

------. "Our London Letter: Art Not Far Behind," Liverpool Post (7 October 1944), p.2.

------. "Our London Letter: In Blue and Gold," Liverpool Post (23 September 1944), p.2.

------. "Our London Letter: The War at Sea," Eastern Daily Press (23 September 1944), p.4.

------. "Pictures of the War at Sea," East Anglian Daily Times (3 October 1944), p.2.

------. "Sea War Recorded On Canvas: Mr. Norman Wilkinson's Gift of Paintings," Times (23 September 1944), p.2.

------. "War Artists Bring Fronts to London," News Chronicle (7 October 1944), p.3.

------. "A Woman's Diary: ... War Pictures," Eastern Daily Press (7 October 1944), p.4.

R.B. "How British Artists Paint Victory at Sea," Art Digest, 19 #5 (1 December 1944), p.14.

Brophy. "The War and Art: Reaction in Britain," Sydney Morning

Herald (27 May 1944), p.6.

Earp, T.W. "New Display of War Pictures: Schornhorst's End," Daily Telegraph (7 March 1944), p.3.

Fell, H. Granville. "The Connoisseur Divan: Three Victory Exhibitions," Connoisseur, 114 (1944), pp.122-124.

Fuller, H.E. "India in Action Pictures: National Gallery Display," [Adelaide] Advertiser (16 September 1944), p.3.

Gordon, Cora. "London Commentary," Studio, 128 #616 (July 1944), pp.26-27.

Lancaster, Osbert. "Art," Observer (15 October 1944), p.2.

N. [Eric Newton]. "New War Pictures," Manchester Guardian (7 October 1944) p.3.

Newton, Eric. "War Artists' Birthday," Sunday Times (12 March 1944), p.2.

Perspex. "Current Shows and Comments: Looking Forward," Apollo, 40 [#10] (October 1940), pp.79-80.

Ross, Marita. "War Artists Go to the Front," [Newcastle-upon-Tyne] Evening Chronicle (10 October 1944), p.2.

L.S. "Mayor Opens Exhibition of Paintings by British and Union War Artists," Rand Daily News (Johannesburg) (11 August 1944); copy in Johannesburg Art Gallery newspaper clippings file.

\*SECTION 6: Exhibition Reviews, 1945.<sup>1</sup>

Anonymous. "Artists in War Paint: Battlefield and Home Front Scenes in 5,000 Pictures," Liverpool Post (15 March 1945), p.2.

-----". "Display of Paintings: Collection of English Artist [Norman Wilkinson]," The [Christchurch, N.Z.] Press (28 January 1947), p.3.

-----". "Exhibition of Naval Paintings Opened by Sir Patrick Duff," [Wellington, N.Z.] Dominion (25 February 1947), p.11.

-----". "Exhibition of War Paintings," Sydney Herald (22 October 1945), p.48.

-----". "Exhibition of War Pictures by Norman Wilkinson," Sydney Morning Herald (22 October 1945), p.5.

-----". "London Diary: ... War Pictures," Nottingham Journal (13 October 1945), p.2.

-----". "'MACH': I'll Back the Artist Against the Photographer," [Sydney] Bulletin (28 November 1945), p.72.

-----". "Pictures of the War," Times (13 October 1945), p.5.

-----". "Royal Academy Exhibition: War Pictures," British Weekly, 119 #3077 (18 October 1945), p.42.

-----". "Sea Warfare Exhibition of Paintings," [Hobart, Tasmania] Mercury (7 March 1946); copy in Australian War Memorial, Archive file AWM 93.

-----". "A Special Exhibition: 'The War at Sea' by Norman Wilkinson," [Sydney] Bulletin (28 August 1945), p.13.

-----". "Sundry Shows," [Sydney] Bulletin, 66 #3419 (22 August 1945), p.2.

-----". "The War at Sea: Exhibition at Museum," [Launceston, Tasmania] Examiner (16 April 1946); copy in Australian War Memorial, Archive file AWM 93.

-----". "War at Sea Pictures," [Launceston, Tasmania] Exam-

---

<sup>1</sup> (Includes reviews of WAAC exhibitions still circulating abroad after the end of 1945.)



iner (17 April 1946); copy in Australian War Memorial, Archive file AWM 93.

----- . War Pictures: Exhibition Opened," [Wellington, N.Z.] Evening Post (14 April 1945), p.9.

----- . "War Pictures: Vast Collection at the Royal Academy; An Amazing Show," Scotsman (13 October 1945), p.7.

----- . "War Portrayed by the Artist's Brush: More Realistic than Camera's Efforts," Sussex Daily News and Brighton Evening Argus (13 October 1945), p.4.

----- . "Wilkinson's Naval Pictures: Authentic Documents," [Wellington, N.Z.] Southern Cross (25 February 1947); copy in National Art Gallery, Wellington)

Ayrton, Michael. "Art," Spectator, 175 #6123 (November 1945), p.408.

Collis, Maurice. "Art," Observer (21 October 1945), p.2.

Francis, Ivor. "Artist's Paintings of the War at Sea," [Adelaide] News (6 September 1945); copy in newspaper clippings file, Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide.

A.G. "War Pictures of Genius," Newcastle Journal and North Mail (13 October 1945), p.2.

Gordon, Cora. "London Commentary," Studio, 129 #623 (February 1945), pp.56-59.

Hendy, Philip. "Art - National War Pictures," Britan To-day, #117 (January 1946 [sic]), pp.33-34.

Markham, Peter M. "Painted for Posterity," Strand Magazine, 110 (November 1945), pp.65-68.

Marvell, Roger. "War Artists and Sculptors," New Statesman and Nation, 30 #765 (20 October 1945), pp.260-261.

Newton, Eric. "War Art in Retrospect," Sunday Times (14 October 1945), p.2.

W.E.P. "Dispassionate British Artist [Norman Wilkinson]," [Sydney] Telegraph (22 October 1945), p.49.

Rothenstein, John. "Reflections on the National War Pictures Exhibition," Country Life, 98 (2 November 1945), pp.776-777.

Salarrue, "Una Exposicion de Arte Britanico en San Salvador,"

Centro America (28 October 1945), pp.2-4.

Simpson, E.C. "Exhibition of War Paintings by British Artist [Norman Wilkinson]," [Wellington, N.Z.] Southern Cross (13 March 1947); copy in National Art Gallery, Wellington.

Swaffer, Hannen. "Soul of a People Shown in Art," Daily Herald (15 October 1945), p.2.

Taylor, J.B. "Art in a Distracted World: II - Goya and War Art," Listener, 33 #836 (18 January 1945), pp.67-68.

[Tilney, F.C.]. "War Pictures at the R.A," Art and Reason, 11 #132 (December 1945), pp.1-2.

\*SECTION 7: Arts and Social Background - Published Materials, and Theses.

Armes, Roy. A Critical History of British Cinema (London: Secker & Warburg, 1978).

Bird, Jon. "Representing the Great War," Block, #3 (1980), pp.41-52.

Branson, Noreen, and Margot Heinemann. Britain in the Nineteen Thirties (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1971).

Calder, Angus. The People's War: Britain, 1939-1945 (London/Toronto/Sydney/New York: Granada, 1982).

Clarke, John, and Chas Critcher and Richard Johnson, eds., Working Class Culture: Studies in History and Theory (London: Hutchinson of London, in association with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham, 1979).

Collins, Richard, James Curran et al, eds., Media, Culture and Society: A Critical Reader (London/Beverly Hills/Newbury Park/New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1986).

Colls, Robert, and Philip Dodd. Englishness: Politics and Culture 1880-1920 (London/New York/Sydney: Croom Helm, 1986).

-----". "Representing the Nation: British Documentary Film, 1930-45," Screen, 26 #1 (January-February 1985), pp.21-33.

Corrigan, Philip, and Derek Sayer. The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution (Oxford/New York: Basil Blackwell, 1985).

Curran, James, and Jean Seaton. Power Without Responsibility: The Press and Broadcasting in Britain (Great Britain: Routledge, 1981).

Davidson, Mildred. A Study of the Poetry of the Spanish Civil War and the Second World War as a Reflection of Its Age (M.A. thesis, University of London, 1959).

Dean, Basil. The Theatre at War (London/Toronto/Wellington/Sydney: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd, 1956).

Fussell, Paul. Wartime: Understanding and Behavior in the Second World War (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

Gans, Herbert J. Popular Culture and High Culture: An Analysis and Evaluation of Taste (New York: Basic Books, Inc, 1944).

Glynn, Sean, and John Oxborrow. Interwar Britain: A Social and Economic History (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1976).

Graves, Robert and Alan Hodge. The Long Week-end: A Social History of Great Britain, 1918-1939 (New York/London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1963).

Hansard.

Harrisson, Tom. Britain Revisited (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd, 1961).

----- . Living Through the Blitz (London: Collins, 1976).

----- . "War Books," Horizon, 4 #24 (December 1941), pp.416-437.

Hewison, Robert. Under Siege: Literary Life in London 1939-1945 (London/Melbourne/New York: Quartet Books, 1979).

Jenkins, Alan. The Forties (London: Heinemann, 1980).

Klein, Holger. "Britain," in Holger Klein (with John Flower and Eric Homberger), ed., The Second World War in Fiction (London/Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1984), pp.1-46.

Lehmann, John. I Am My Brother: Autobiography II (London: Longmans, Green and Co Ltd, 1960).

Liddell Hart, B.H. History of the Second World War (London/Sydney: Pan Books, 1970).

Longmate, Norman, ed. The Home Front: An Anthology of Personal Experience, 1938-1945 (London: Chatto & Windus, 1981).

----- . How We Lived Then: A History of Everyday Life During the Second World War (London: Hutchinson of London, 1971).

Madge, Charles and Tom Harrisson. Britain by Mass-Observation (England: Penguin Books Limited, 1939).

Malvern, Susan. Art, Propaganda and Patronage. An History of the Employment of British Artists 1916-1919 (Ph.D. thesis, University of Reading, 1981).

Marwick, Arthur. Britain in the Century of Total War: War, Peace and Social Change, 1900-1967 (London/Sydney/Toronto: The Bodley Head, 1968).

----- . The Explosion of British Society, 1914-1970 (London: Macmillan, 1971).

----- . The Home Front (London: Thames & Hudson, 1976).

Mass-Observation, (ed. and arranged by Tom Harrisson and Charles Madge). War Begins at Home (London: Chatto & Windus, 1940).

Mowat, Charles Loch. Britain Between the Wars: 1918-1940 (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1956).

Muggeridge, Malcolm. The Thirties: 1930-1940 in Great Britain (London: Collins, 1967; first edition 1940).

Myers, Rollo, Music Since 1939 (series: Arts in Britain) (England: Longmans Green & Co, [1946/1947]).

Nevins, Allan. This is England Today (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941).

Nicolson, Harold (Nigel Nicolson, ed.). Diaries and Letters 1939-1945 (London: Collins, 1967).

Norburn, E.R. English War Novels of the Second World War (M.A. thesis, University of Nottingham, 1964).

Powell, Dilys. Films Since 1939 (series: Arts in Britain) (England: Longmans, Green & Co, [1946/1947]).

Prochaska, Alice. London in the Thirties (London: HMSO, 1973).

Reed, Henry. The Novel Since 1939 (London/New York/Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co, for the British Council, 1946).

Ross, Alan. The Forties: A Period Piece (London: George Weidenfeld & Nicolson Limited, 1950).

Rowntree, B. Seebohm and G.R. Lavers. English Life and Leisure: A Social Study (London/New York/Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co, 1951).

Scott, Alison H. English Poetry of the Second World War (M.Litt. thesis, Aberdeen University, 1968).

Seaman, L.C.B. Post-Victorian Britain, 1902-1951 (London: Methuen and Co Ltd, 1966).

- Sillars, Stuart. "Icons of Englishness: Tradition and Development in the Arts of the Great War," Critical Quarterly, 23 #2 (Summer 1981), pp.51-59.
- Sinclair, Andrew. War Like a Wasp: The Lost Decade of the Forties (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1989).
- Stanford, Derek. Inside the Forties (London: 1977).
- Stevenson, John. British Society, 1914-1945 (London: Allen Lane, 1984).
- Symons, Julian. The Thirties: A Dream Revolved (London: The Cresset Press, 1960).
- Taylor, A.J.P. English History, 1914-1945 (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1965).
- Thomson, David. England in the Twentieth Century (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1965).
- Tippett, Maria Wendy. The History of the Canadian War Memorial Scheme as a Study of Patronage and Visual Record of the Great War (Ph.D. thesis, University College, London, 1982). Revised and published as Art at the Service of War: Canada, Art, and the Great War (Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 1984).
- Tschiffely, A.F. Bohemia Junction (London: 1950).
- Turner, E.S. The Phoney War on the Home Front (London: Michael Joseph, 1961).
- Wiener, Martin J. English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850-1980 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
- Williams, Raymond. Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays (London/New York: Verso Editions and NLB, 1980).
- [Various authors]. History of the Second World War (London: HMSO and Longmans, Green and Co, various dates).